

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR SWETE has edited another volume of Cambridge Essays. The former was a volume of Theological essays; this volume is Biblical. Its full title is *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day* (Macmillan; 12s. net).

The authors of the essays are without exception men of mark. There are no surprises out of the unknown. The topics treated of are also within the range of the expected. Yet there is a surprise in the book. The surprise is its agnosticism. And the greatness of the surprise is that not one or two of the writers, but that all the writers, without exception, are agnostics.

We do not use the word 'agnostic' with the Huxley meaning. We do not suggest that these Cambridge scholars have any doubt about the existence of God; or for a moment hesitate to affirm that He is a God with whom they have to do. They know both that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Their agnosticism is scientific. It is a restraint, not upon their profession of faith, but upon their profession of knowledge. Much as they are absolutely sure of in the region of the Spirit, in the region of historical affirmation they have learned one and all to hold their hand.

This is a new note of English scholarship. The

VOL. XXI.—NO. 4.—JANUARY 1910.

note was struck in Oxford, but Cambridge has given it united voice. It is partly conscious. It is a protest against the raging dogmatism of some recent Continental scholarship, a dogmatism that has been all the more dogmatical that it has mainly been denial. But it is chiefly quite unconscious. It has arisen more than anything else from recognizing the amount of mischief that has been done in the study of the Bible from the indiscriminate use of the argument from silence.

One of the strangest uses of the argument from silence ever made, was made quite recently by a writer who was arguing against the sinlessness of our Lord. We have no records of the first thirty years of His life, therefore we may say that He was not sinless. That was the argument. The writer admitted that He was sinless so far as the records exist. These Cambridge essayists do not argue from the unknown *against* the known; they do not argue from the unknown at all. One and all they say what they know, and hold their hand. And yet, perhaps, none of them puts quite so much restraint upon himself as does Mr. C. H. W. JOHNS, the Master of St. Catharine's College.

Mr. JOHNS has written an essay on 'The Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament.' Now, we all desire to know what influence the Babylonian Mythology has had

upon the Old Testament. We desire this for apologetic reasons, and for scientific reasons, and for the mere sake of knowing. For is not man the animal that would like to know? And if any one, in Cambridge or out of it, can tell us, it is the Master of St. Catharine's College.

But Mr. JOHNS does not tell us. The similarity between the myths of the early chapters of Genesis and the myths of Babylon is notorious. But what is similarity? The Professor of Zend Philology in Oxford, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for last month, showed us two nations making the discovery of the same striking religious conceptions side by side and independently. So it is at least possible, says Mr. JOHNS, that the striking resemblances between the Flood story of the Babylonians and the Flood story of the Hebrews are due to parallel and independent development. That is the first theory.

But mythology is so widespread, it is such a *human* thing, that independent development is almost out of the question. There is no need, says Mr. JOHNS, to suggest independence, nor is there any necessity to go directly to Babylonian sources in order to account for the Hebrews having a Deluge story or a cosmogony. The myth of the Deluge is so ancient and so widespread that all we have to do is to carry both back to some common Semitic ancestor. That is the second theory.

Mr. JOHNS calls this 'a comfortable doctrine.' He means, apparently, that it has been the refuge of the believer in Inspiration. Given an original myth, it is always possible and may be easy to show how the Babylonians would let it develop on its superstitious side, and how the Hebrews would be guided to give it real religious value. But Mr. JOHNS counts it but a temporary resting-place. For it is after all a myth.

And there is no doubt, as Mr. JOHNS again reminds us, that mythology in the Bible is to most of us 'a very shocking idea.' But why is it

shocking? Because by a 'myth' we mean such a story as in our early classical studies we read and were shocked at in connexion with the gods of Greece and Rome. Mr. JOHNS feels the offence himself. He cannot quite rid himself of certain unbecoming recollections. And he wishes some one would invent another word.

But until the new word comes, it is well to understand what the old word really means. It is an attempt to put a scientific hypothesis into pre-scientific language. Say that an eclipse has taken place: what is the cause of it? The pre-scientific scientist says that a dragon has devoured the sun.

Now it is quite possible that the original inventor of that hypothesis believed that a dragon did actually devour the sun. In that case he would be a scientific observer pure and simple, with a scientific hypothesis very much at fault. But it is also possible that he simply used metaphorical language because he had nothing else to convey his meaning with. 'Some peoples,' says Mr. JOHNS, 'can only express the idea of conquering another folk by the words "we eat them up." They are not therefore to be regarded as cannibals. The Babylonian talked of "eating" a field when he meant enjoying the usufruct of it.'

Take the case of the Chaos. The Babylonians spoke of a certain monster Tiamat. But Tiamat may be nothing whatever but water, and the theory that all was once water is as really scientific, says Mr. JOHNS, as the opinion that all was once gaseous matter. Now, water in the form of an ocean was such a restless, fierce monster to early man that to speak of it as a dragon was natural. It does not follow, therefore, that the Babylonian myth is so different from the Hebrew explanation. It may be a matter of more or less mythological language. In any case, it does not follow that we need be desperately alarmed at the presence of a myth in the Old Testament.

Well, as we have said, Mr. JOHNS is agnostic.

He makes many pleasant suggestions; he does not come to many definite conclusions. But we think we shall not misrepresent him if we say that his own theory of the influence of Babylonian mythology upon the Old Testament is none of these. There is a third theory. Before stating it, we may just notice a possible fourth. It is the theory that whatever Babylonianism there is in the Old Testament came into it at and after the captivity. For that theory Mr. JOHNS seems to have little liking.

The third theory is that the Hebrew narratives of the Creation, the Flood, and the rest, are fragments of one stream of tradition, and the Babylonian myths are fragments of another. Besides the Babylonian version with which the narratives of the Bible are usually compared, there is another Babylonian version, which differs as much from the well-known version as that does from the Old Testament.

This does not mean that all three must be tried back to one Semitic original. All three may be independent. And all three may go back to an original beyond even the Semitic, an original which is as far back as to be for all practical purposes universal.

And thus are we led to a much more momentous remark, in making which we hope again that we do not misrepresent Mr. JOHNS. It is the mark that Mr. JOHNS sees nothing unique about the Hebrew religion which would exempt it from operation of laws admitted to work in the case of other religions.

A history of the opposition to the infallibility of the Pope, urged by Roman Catholics themselves, has been written by the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford. The book is noticed on another page.

Is there any foundation in Scripture for the

doctrine of infallibility? The Ultramontane says there is. Its foundation is found in the words of our Lord to Peter: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren' (Lk 22<sup>32</sup>). Mr. SPARROW SIMPSON discusses the Roman interpretation of that passage.

The passage is worth discussion for its own sake. It is worth more than discussion, it is worth appropriation. Spoken originally to Peter by the Christ about to suffer, it may well be taken as spoken now by the risen Christ to each of us. But if it is the foundation of the dogma of papal infallibility it assumes a new importance. It has now an importance that is not only experimental, but also historical. What, then, is the Roman Catholic interpretation of this passage?

It consists of four statements. First, Christ here confers on Peter an exclusive prerogative, on the ground of Peter's superior position. Secondly, this prerogative is infallible insight. Thirdly, he was thereby enabled to give infallible instructions to his brethren. Fourthly, this prerogative extends to all Peter's successors, and to none but those—the prerogative being as exclusive in its range as it was in its origin. Mr. SIMPSON considers the text under four heads also. His heads are Christ's Prayer; Peter's Faith; Peter's Brethren; and Peter's Successors.

He considers first Christ's Prayer—'I have prayed for thee.' He says it is certainly an exclusive prayer. Satan hath desired to have *you*, collectively; but I have prayed for *thee*, St. Peter, individually. Christ here prays for the one: for the others, on this occasion, He does not pray. Does not this, then, imply the superiority of the individual so distinguished? Mr. SIMPSON says it does not. The exclusive petition may imply the greater superiority of the person prayed for; it may equally well imply his greater need. Mr. SIMPSON believes that if we consider the character of Peter and the nature of the coming trial we shall

come to the conclusion that on this occasion particular prayer meant particular need of prayer.

And there is another thing about the prayer. If it was exclusive, it was also conditional. No doubt it is true that whatever Christ prays for comes to pass. Is it not written, 'I know that thou hearest me always'? 'But,' says Mr. SIMPSON,—and it is right well worth saying,—'the effectiveness of Christ's prayers must take into account our human independence. To say that the prayer of Christ must necessarily realize its design, is really to reduce mankind to a mechanism upon which the Spirit plays.' The prayer for Peter is an offer of sufficient grace, but Peter must yield his will to the grace that is offered.

The next thing is Peter's Faith—'That thy faith fail not.' Now there is no difficulty in understanding what is meant here by Peter's faith, and there is no serious difficulty in understanding what is meant by his faith failing. His faith is not an intellectual assent to a number of propositions—the suggestion is itself preposterous. It is a moral relation to a Person. It is devotion to Christ Himself, and it calls not only upon the intellect, but also upon the affections and the will.

What happens, then, to a man's faith when it is said to fail? It suffers an eclipse. The Greek word here translated 'fail' is sometimes used to describe an eclipse. And to the primitive imagination an eclipse suggested death, much as we talk of the dying day. 'Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail'—the meaning is that they shall not come to an end or cease to be.

Was Christ's prayer answered? Did Peter's faith cease to be? It did not cease to be for ever. We may say, indeed, that that faith in Christ which lay within the heart of Peter, that personal devotion to Christ which was his faith, did not cease to be even for a single moment. But certainly its outward expression suffered an eclipse. And that is most unfortunate for the argument of

the Roman theologian, who uses Peter's experience to prove his infallibility. For infallibility is nothing if it is not infallibility in expression. So far as the doctrine of infallibility is concerned, it does not matter what Peter or his successors believe in their hearts. The infallibility must belong to their utterance. Peter's utterance was far from infallible when he said, 'I know not the man.'

The third thing is the strengthening of Peter's Brethren—'when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.' Now to strengthen is to give support. The word is employed by St. Paul. To the Romans he says, 'I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be *established*' (Ro 1<sup>11</sup>). He sends Timothy to the Thessalonians, 'to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith' (1 Th 3<sup>2</sup>). St Peter uses the word also. He desires that God would 'stablish, strengthen, settle' the Christians (1 P 5<sup>10</sup>); and he says that Christians are 'established in the present truth' (2 P 1<sup>12</sup>). And St John uses the word: 'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die (Rev 3<sup>2</sup>).

These passages show that to strengthen one's brethren is to lend them moral support. And it may be moral support of almost any kind. It may be the support of a man who has received richly of grace divine, or of one who has entered largely into a knowledge of the truth. But where is the suggestion made that a man must be infallible before he can strengthen his brethren? Is there any one who would have repudiated infallibility, even in the days that were to follow, more emphatically than Peter himself? Nay, the history tells us very plainly that Peter could fail to strengthen his brethren even in the ordinary way of affording them moral support. Or at least, if Peter was infallible when that sharp contention took place at Antioch between him and Paul, what shall we the say about the Apostle Paul?

The last point is about Peter's Successors. Bu-

text fails us here. Our Lord does not mention successors. He does not mention them even by implication. Peter's successors may be read in Christ's words; they cannot be read out of him.

---

But if the words 'strengthen thy brethren' are aimed for Peter's successors, then the words 'when thou art converted' must belong to them also. Bellarmin saw this, and was disturbed by it. He suggested that 'converted' must not be understood as moral renovation and repentance, but as an adverb equivalent to 'in turn,' as if the passage said: 'I have strengthened thee, do thou in turn strengthen thy brethren.' But when Bellarmin gave up that interpretation, says Mr. SPARROW THOMAS, he gave up the case.

---

About a year ago an article appeared in the *Hibbert Journal* with the title of 'Jesus or Christ?' It was not a valuable article. It would probably not have been written if its author had been better educated. The chance that it would be accepted by any editor was one in a hundred. Yet that chance came to it. It was accepted by the editor of the *Hibbert Journal*. It was printed, and appeared in the issue of that journal for January 1899.

---

It was a bad article, and it was badly printed. Professor SCHMIEDEL's 'Nine Foundation Pillars,' which he has had so much trouble in getting published, suffered the worst shipwreck that has yet fallen them. The sentence appeared in this article: 'Following it [criticism], we pass through narrowing areas of admissible statement, and, guided by Dr. SCHMIEDEL's "pillar," pass ages [passages], till we reach the position of Professor KHALTOFF [for "KALTHOFF"], from which the figure of the historic Jesus has completely vanished.'<sup>1</sup>

This sentence in the amended edition of the article published at the end of this volume now reads: 'Following it, we pass along narrowing areas of admissible statement, through the textual territory marked by Dr.

Yet the editor tells us that within a week of the publication of the article, 'replies and criticisms, eulogies and condemnations, began to pour in from all quarters.' The statement is not complimentary to the readers of the *Hibbert Journal*. The article was not worth condemnation.

---

But whatever he thought of the article, the idea came to the editor that a certain number of men should be invited to express themselves on the alternative, 'Jesus or Christ?' which the title of the article suggested. Seventeen men responded to his invitation. Their contributions, together with an amended edition of the original article, have been issued as a volume. Its title is still 'Jesus or Christ?' (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net).

---

Below the title of the article in the *Hibbert Journal* the author was named Rev. R. ROBERTS, and described as 'Congregational Minister.' But Dr. Horton promptly replied that the Rev. R. ROBERTS had not been a Congregational minister for eleven years. From the article itself it was evident that he was a Unitarian. The title 'Jesus or Christ?' was cleverly chosen to express the difference between Unitarians and Trinitarians. And by that difference the writers of the papers in the volume must be distinguished. They are not representative. The editor, being himself a Unitarian, may be excused for giving a preponderance to Unitarians. But the proportion of two to one is excessive. And yet, just because of the preponderance of what the editor would call 'liberal' opinion—the opinion of those to whom Jesus was 'a mere man'—the book is crammed with encouragement.

---

The title is 'Jesus or Christ?' Now Jesus stands for 'this human being,' to use the phrase of Professor WEINER. And, as we have said, more than two-thirds of the authors of the volume look upon Jesus as 'this human being,' and no more. The

SCHMIEDEL's "pillar" passages, till we reach the position of KALTHOFF, from which the figure of the historic Jesus has completely vanished.'

expression which has already been used is 'mere man,' and that expression is familiar now. But Professor Henry JONES, of Glasgow, objects to it. He thinks that it implies 'blasphemy against human nature.' But Professor JONES has forgotten the history of the word 'mere.'

It is one of the first words that Abbott calls attention to in his *Shakespearian Grammar*. 'Mere,' he says 'is unmixed with anything else,' hence, by inference, 'intact,' 'complete'; and the quotation he makes is from *Othello*, II. ii. 3—'The mere perdition of the Turkish fleet,' that is, its complete destruction. Other examples will be found in Murray; to which we may add one from *Robinson Crusoe* (Defoe is curiously fond of the word)—'I went down to my Farm, and became in one half Year, a meer Country Gentleman.'

To say, then, that Jesus was a mere man, is to say that He was not more than a man. It is not to say that He was less. There is here and there in this volume an inclination to suggest that believers in the Divinity of Jesus do not believe in His humanity. But that is not so. They believe, as sincerely as Professor SCHMIEDEL, that He was 'a man in the full sense of the term.' As Professor Percy GARDNER says: 'The Church has insisted on the belief that after all her Master was a "perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting."

The question is, was He more than man? And it is an important question. Some of the writers in this volume recognize its importance. Says Dr. GARVIE: 'It will be generally recognized that this is probably the most urgent and important question with which the Christian theologian, in seeking to expound and defend the Christian faith, is to-day called to deal.'

Now the way in which the distinction is made between Jesus as man and Jesus as more than man is by the alternative title 'Jesus or Christ?' That is plainly the result, whatever may have been

the purpose, of the article which opened the discussion. But that is just what the majority of the writers in this volume deny. They accept 'Jesus,' and they accept 'Christ.' They believe that Jesus was a mere man; but to express His mere manhood they claim not only the name 'Jesus,' but also the name 'Christ.'

They do not all do so. Professor SCHMIEDEL, who is perhaps the most uncompromising Unitarian in the list, tells us that he is most particular not to do so. 'I maintain,' he says, 'a clear distinction between the terms "Jesus" and "Christ" in my own practice, and demand that it shall be maintained in the intercourse of theologians with one another.' But the Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL does so. Mr. CAMPBELL says there is no need of the alternative 'Jesus or Christ.' 'For the greatness of Jesus consists in the fact that He has made the word "Christ" a synonym for the best and highest that can truly be called human. And with that the majority agree.'

Here, then, is the first thing to settle. Here is the secret of the interest which the original article has raised. Put the matter plainly as an issue between Unitarian and Trinitarian, and only a small proportion of the readers even of the *Hibernian Journal* would hesitate to take their side. But argue that all that is involved in the word 'Christ' may be saved without passing the bounds of the human, and the argument will be listened to with respect. That is what the majority of the Unitarians who write in this volume see. That is how they argue.

The most beautiful of the papers is the one that has been written by Dr. James DRUMMOND, late Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. It is the paper of a Unitarian, of that there is no doubt. Manchester College is a Unitarian College; and Dr. DRUMMOND describes himself in his article as a Unitarian. Yet so wholly does Dr. DRUMMOND absorb the title 'Christ' that we should not have known, and we believe no one else would have

known, from the article itself, if the author had not called himself a Unitarian in it, that Dr. DRUMMOND was not a believer in the Divinity of our Lord. So far as we can see, Christ is everything to him that He is to any of us. Take a single sentence : 'There are those who have, through the medium of the New Testament and the traditional life of the purest Christendom, looked into the face of Jesus, and seen there an ideal, a glory which they have felt to be the glory of God, a thought of Divine Sonship, which has changed their whole conception of human nature, and the whole aim of their life ; and no criticisms and no shortcomings can alter that supreme fact of spiritual experience.'

---

The reference is unmistakable. It is Dr. DRUMMOND himself that sees the glory of God in the face of Jesus. And Dr. DRUMMOND does not stand here alone. His is the most charming paper. But the paper of Professor Percy GARDNER is only a degree less charming. Take a rather longer quotation. Professor GARDNER does not describe himself in set words as a Unitarian, but he certainly does not believe in the Deity of Christ. Yet he claims so much of what a Professor SCHMIEDEL would strictly reserve for 'Christ,' that he is able to speak in this way.

---

'Take them as we will,' he says, 'the facts of early Christianity are of a most surprising, unparalleled character. Such facts as it offers are so unusual that no one save a shallow sciolist would be ready with a cut-and-dried explanation of them. There is the astonishing life of the Master, which has impressed many who were not professed Christians with an admiration almost beyond expression. There is the wonderful change which came over the Apostles after the time of the Crucifixion, transforming them from timid and half-appreciative disciples into bold and effective missionaries of the faith. There is the rapid spread of the new doctrine, in the face of bitter hostility and persecution. There is the remarkable ethical similarity between the teaching of Paul and that of

his Master, while at the same time in his hands the Christian teaching undergoes a prodigious development, becoming fit, not for an obscure sect of Jews, but for the great cities of the Greek world. These and many other such historic phenomena seem to me to be only explicable by the supposition that a mighty spiritual power of a new kind and of greatly superior force was dawning on the world, a power not easily to be accounted for, yet in all things to be taken into account.'

---

Now although Dr. DRUMMOND's and Professor GARDNER's articles are the most attractive of the Unitarian articles in the volume, and Professor SCHMIEDEL's is the most unattractive, yet Professor SCHMIEDEL is right, and they are wrong. Of that there is no doubt whatever. They claim the title 'Christ' as belonging to their Unitarianism, but history is wholly against them. Whenever the things of the moral and spiritual life, which have been so winningly described here, are found attached to Christ, they are found associated with belief in His Divinity. Not one of the writers in this volume has discovered a case to the contrary.

---

It is, in truth, a wholly new attitude to Christ that is taken up by the distinguished men who write in this volume. We have often seen the blessings of Christianity appropriated by those who refuse to call themselves Christians. That is a quite familiar attitude. But here are men to whom Jesus was a mere man, however they may endeavour to escape the edge of that word 'mere,' claiming for themselves all that the Church has obtained from its faith in Jesus Christ as the God-Man ; and yet they write as if their claims were legitimate and undeniable.

---

That claim has to be rejected. There is so much sweet reasonableness in it, and so much goodwill in the men who make it, that some courage may be required from those who withstand it. Yet we must withstand it to the face. For it contradicts the whole history of Christianity. It reduces to impotence that Gospel which is the

power of God unto salvation. And more than that, however these courteous scholars may protest, none the less is it true that it makes both 'Jesus' and 'Christ' names of no particular importance to the world.

---

It makes 'Jesus' and 'Christ,' we say, names of no particular importance. Professor JONES protests. And we gladly admit that Professor JONES has done his best with that human Jesus whom he has no objection to calling 'Christ.' But what does his effort amount to? Jesus is historical, Christ is ideal. And then his whole endeavour is to reduce the difference between Christ and other men. Take Jesus alone, and we have a man subject to like infirmities (and sins) as we are. Take Jesus Christ together, and we have the ideal man. This ideal man has never yet been seen on earth. But he has been conceived by the heart of man, and he is set up as a standard of encouragement to man's hope.

---

Professor JONES is strongly opposed to the separation of the one man Christ Jesus from every other man. His words in one place are, 'I venture to say that there is one theory which is fundamentally inimical to every Christian faith—namely, that which separates man from Christ.' And he is right. That is the fundamental heresy. Even a theory of representation is not enough. Professor JONES does well to insist on identification.

---

But he mistakes altogether the point at which the identification is made. He thinks that the work of Christ consisted in revealing the Fatherhood of God, and as a consequence the sonship of man, and that Christ and man were brought together in that way, both being shown to be sons of God. Who revealed the Father, he does not say clearly. Sometimes he seems to say that Jesus the man of Nazareth did it; sometimes that it was done by the Church under the name of the 'ideal' Christ. But however it was done, this, he says, was the work that Christ came to do. And when you speak of 'conversion,' all you mean

is 'the recognition by man of a relationship that existed from the beginning.'

---

And this is not peculiar to Professor JONES. 'There is no doubt,' says Professor SCHMIEDEL, that his making the conception of God as the Father, which indeed was not new, the central point of his religion, was a fact of the greatest importance.' And Professor BACON, of Yale, makes the sweeping assertion: 'There is nothing further to be said in the name of religion for the guidance of humanity than is implied in the three syllables of Jesus' message: "Our Father." This is the gospel; the rest is commentary.'

---

But if this is the gospel, how can Professor SCHMIEDEL say it was not new? The gospel was new if it was anything. That it was new was understood to have been the first announcement of it. That it was new was the unwavering delight of every 'individual Christian believer.' We believe as heartily as Professor JONES, or any other, that Christ brought the revelation of God's Fatherhood to men—all that is essential and operative for salvation in it. But whether *that* was 'new' or not we are not greatly concerned to discuss; for it is quite certain that *that* is not the gospel.

---

Professor JONES says that Christ 'came to declare the Father.' Where did he find that? Not in the New Testament. In the Gospels we are told that Christ came to call sinners, that He came to seek and to save the lost, that He came to give His life as a ransom; and with that the rest of the Scriptures of the New Testament agree. But where is it said that He came to reveal God's Fatherhood? Being here, He did reveal the Father. But that He *came for that purpose*—that is never said or suggested.

---

Nor is that ever named in all the history of the Church of Christ as the purpose of the Incarnation. History is as adverse to this modern notion as the New Testament. But here we have only

to make one writer answer another. Professor SCHMIEDEL agrees with the others that the revelation of the Divine Fatherhood is a fact of the greatest importance. 'At the same time,' he proceeds to say, 'we must carefully guard ourselves from attaching a too unqualified value to this conception. We ought not to forget that it is only one image, and that this image does not express everything that we are compelled to include in our thought of God.'

We do not overlook the fact that Professor JONES does go to Scripture for a proof of his statement that Jesus 'came to declare the Father.' But what Scripture? The Parable of the Prodigal Son. And in this he is at one with Professor SCHMIEDEL. The rest have left that parable alone. But how long will it be before all men will understand that that parable, as every other parable, was spoken on a special occasion and for a special purpose? It was spoken to the Pharisees because they complained that He received sinners and ate with them. And it was spoken to show them that God was as willing to receive sinners as they were unwilling. But the method of the reception was not in question, and was not considered. Besides, even if the occasion and meaning of the parable were less obvious than they are, what would become of Theology if a doctrine were held to be proved simply because it seemed to be implied in some particular parable? Does Professor JONES believe that there is a hell where the tongues of wicked men are parched in flames of fire? There is a parable which seems to say so. Does he hold that it is the final word on the subject?

Professor JONES is right in insisting on the identification of Christ with men. But the identification takes place, not because Christ happened to be born into the world as other men, but because He deliberately came into the world to redeem men. And now observe the difference.

In order to identify Christ with men Professor

JONES has to deny His uniqueness. And he finds it very difficult to deny it successfully. He does not invite us to look at the facts, whether in Scripture or in the Christian life. He relies on general observation. 'I cannot see,' he says, 'what accession of spiritual power Christianity can have from demonstrating the *unlikeness* of Jesus of Nazareth to other men.' And again, 'By making the relation of Jesus to God unique, the idealizing light which He threw upon human nature through the momentous conception of its affinity to the divine is obscured.'

But even in this way he is unable to exclude the idea of uniqueness wholly. 'I can well believe,' he says, 'that He felt that He stood alone in His mission; and that the revelation had come to Him with a fulness and power with which it came to no other, I do not doubt.' In like manner Professor WEINEL, while denying the uniqueness of the person of Christ, admits that 'we must leave him his own peculiar work, which was to give humanity a new ideal and a new belief in God—the purest ideal and the loftiest belief'—though he immediately thinks it necessary to prove that this is not 'another exaggeration.' And even Professor SCHMIEDEL, most contentedly prosaic of them all, takes alarm at the result of denying Jesus all uniqueness whatever. 'The more the Godhead of Jesus, the miracles, and the sacrificial death are surrendered, the more pressing becomes the demand that his ideas must have been new without qualification, otherwise the value of his life's achievement appears in danger of gradually dwindling towards zero.'

None of this is the uniqueness claimed for Christ by the believer in His Divinity, nor all of this together. But it is good so far as it goes. And it shows how hard a task the modern philosopher has set himself when he attempts to prove that Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, *including sin*.

Including sin. For, of course, the mere man is

sinful. Not one of these Unitarian authors has any doubt about that. How could they? As Professor SCHMIEDEL bluntly puts it, 'If the position that he was man be accepted without reserve, the question, whether he was sinless, takes the following form: Can a man be sinless?' And accordingly the Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL dismisses the matter with an impatient shrug: 'To speak of Him as morally perfect is absurd; to call Him sinless is worse.'

And thus is opened up the whole practical question: How, then, can Jesus Christ be our example? That He is our example is the one great fact which these men rescue from the wreck of historic Christianity. It is their one great consolation prize to a disappointed world. This, according to Professor JONES, is the worth of His life. This, according to Professor SCHMIEDEL, is the value of His death. 'He thereby showed himself willing to champion his cause by suffering martyrdom for its sake, and not merely to proclaim it before the world as a teacher.'

But of what is this Jesus an example? Of intellectual attainment? By no means. Of moral excellence? Not at all. Of religious superiority? Certainly not. In all these things, according to all these writers (with the possible exception of Dr. DRUMMOND) He fell short. It is true that the Church has made an ideal figure of the historical Jesus, and to that figure has attributed everything that we look for in our example. But the historical Jesus is no example. And even the men who adopt the Church's ideal do so with this reservation, that in *some* things He comes short.

Is it answered that an example does not need to be perfect? Professor JONES makes that answer. He says that a life which is not perfect is all the better example. But that is not true. And if Professor JONES were writing again, he would admit that an example, whether of living or of dying, cannot be less than perfect, that in so far as it is not perfect it is not an example.

We do not wish to urge the matter, because the example of Christ is not the gospel. But it is the only gospel which is left for those who surrender the Godhead—it is well to see that, and to say it.

And there is another thing that has to be said. Why is it that these scholars, who cannot free themselves from the fascination of Christ, do not go all the way and, with 'doubting' Thomas, say at last, 'My Lord and my God'? They do not deny the uplift which is found by other men in that 'faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me.' Some of them have even experienced it. Dr. James DRUMMOND has certainly experienced it; and we believe that Professor Percy GARDNER has experienced it also. But when they all see what this faith has done for other men—and, with the possible exception again of Professor SCHMIEDEL, they do all see and acknowledge it—why is it that they themselves stop short of it?

We shall be bold enough to go to a volume of sermons for the answer. There is a volume published this month by a preacher of the name of Henry W. CLARK. In that volume there is a sermon on 'Lost Spiritual Opportunities.' The occasion of it is Thomas, the 'doubting' disciple of our Lord. Mr. CLARK's answer to our question is that, as Thomas 'was not with them' when the rest of the disciples had their experience, he doubted if they had it. His doubt was due to the neglect of being in the way. For—and now let us quote Mr. CLARK—'For the inevitable consequence of practical neglect in the search for Christly communions is a sense of unreality in Christly communions. Whatever of scepticism there was in Thomas was scepticism of this type. Such a revelation of Christ as the other disciples claimed to have received was to him unreal—whatever might be the abstract possibility or impossibility of such a revelation being given—simply because he had cut himself off therefrom. What he had not experienced, what he had prevented himself from experiencing, stood in his thought as a thing that would not and could not befall.'

# Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.

BY THE REV. P. J. MACLAGAN, M.A., D.PHIL., SWATOW.

At the outset it is as well to define our subject. For Taoism offers itself to us in two forms. There is the Taoism of Lao-tsze as set forth in his *Tao Teh King*, and there is the popular Taoism of the present day. When we speak of Taoism as along with Confucianism and Buddhism making up the three religious or doctrines of China, it is this popular Taoism of which we must think. But it is the Taoism of Lao-tsze which is the proper subject of this paper. The two forms of Taoism are, of course, related to each other. One might illustrate the relation between them by the relation between the Christianity of the New Testament and the popular Roman Catholicism of one of the least enlightened Roman Catholic countries. And just as Christianity is more fairly represented by its New Testament form than by its corrupt and semi-paganized sequel, so Taoism in its classic form is to be sought in the book which is ascribed to Lao-tsze rather than in the medley of idolatry and magic which is to-day called Taoism. Our subject, then, is the Taoism of Lao-tsze, and his book the *Tao Teh King*.

In my treatment of this subject I shall not on this occasion begin at the beginning. In writing this paper I had prepared an introduction giving all that can claim to be of historic value in the stories we have of Lao-tsze, and touching on the critical questions that have been raised as to the book that is claimed as his. Critical questions are apt to be dry, and discussion of them tedious. I should have tried to enliven my remarks by introducing specimens of the vagaries of Chinese scholarship and of subjective criticism in that field. I should have asked you to share with me for a moment or two the Lucretian joy of standing on some serene mount of lofty indifference, and surveying, on the darkling plain below, the turmoil of battle, where Legge and Giles and Balfour and Parker and Kingsmill are fighting pretty much each man for his own hand. But, on the whole, you may be glad to have escaped these preliminary matters on which sinologues are still disputing. I shall only say that the generally accepted date of Lao-tsze's birth is 604 B.C., some fifty years before the birth of Confucius. And as to the

*Tao Teh King* itself, I feel at liberty, after weighing as well as I can all that I have found written by critics on one side or the other, to treat it as, in the main, the work of Lao-tsze. Even if that be not admitted, it is at least the authority for Taoism in its classical form, and it is in this way that I shall speak of it.

Its Chinese title is *Tao Teh King*, which we may so far translate 'The Classic of Tao and Teh.' These two words we may at present leave untranslated. To know what this word 'Tao' means, or rather, for the two things are not necessarily coincident, to know what Lao-tsze meant by Tao, is to have the key to the interpretation of the whole book; and as 'Tao' has been variously rendered by scholars, I shall leave it meanwhile in what is perhaps for most of us its complete emptiness of meaning, perfectly neutral in the strife of sinological tongues. It is the unknown which, I hope, may, as we proceed, become more definite for us.

In our attempt to understand the teaching of the *Tao Teh King* we may begin with the first chapter, which is one of the most important metaphysically. In a translation which imitates as far as possible the baldness of the Chinese text, it runs as follows: 'The Tao that can be expressed is not the Eternal Tao; the name that can be named is not the Eternal Name. Nameless, the beginning of Heaven and Earth: Named, the mother of all things. Therefore, he who is ever free from desire can perceive the inner essence: he who ever has desire can perceive only the (outer) limit. These two (the Nameless and the Named) are the same: once the process begins, they are distinguished in name. As the same, they may be called the Obscure. The Obscurity of the Obscure is the gate of all essences.' This then is the text, I admit not a very lucid one, from which we must begin our exposition.

Permit me at the outset to eliminate from our discussion of this chapter one sentence. You will have noticed, along with what is said of Tao, a psychological, or what might even be called an ethical element, in the allusion to the effect of desire. We must be purged of passion if we

would even see Tao. Knowledge, knowledge at least of the ultimate realities, is in this chapter described as only attainable by a moral process, or is at least morally conditioned. In later chapters Lao-tsze carries to strange lengths his theory of the knowledge that is possible to followers of the Taoistic discipline; and his hints were exaggerated by his successors. That need not occupy us now. What we have before us here is the fact of the moral conditions of ultimate knowledge, religious knowledge. And it is hardly necessary to remind you how this fact is insisted on, as by many others of the greatest teachers of mankind, so also in the pages of the New Testament. 'Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God'; 'He that loveth not, knoweth not God.' This reference to the condition of knowing Tao, Lao-tsze introduces in a characteristically naïve way; for in spite of the introductory 'therefore,' it is rather placed alongside the metaphysical doctrine than deduced from it. That it is so introduced is, however, an indication of the fact that Lao-tsze's doctrine, metaphysical and ethical, is one—in short, a system. I content myself here with pointing this out, and now, leaving meanwhile on one side this psychological or ethical element, I ask your attention to what this opening chapter tells us of Tao.

What may fairly be gathered from this chapter is, I think, something like this—Tao is not some one definite thing. All that is definite and so nameable or expressible in words is temporary. The Eternal Existence eludes speech. This eternal Un-nameable is the origin, not the creator, of the universe. So in relation to the universe of things the Un-nameable may be named as Mother. Named or Un-nameable, however, it is one and the same. Nothing can be predicated of it. It is the absolutely dark and obscure. It is essential existence and the source of all essences. The essence of each individual thing comes from this ultimate essence.

So far our first chapter takes us. Let us now add what further descriptions of Tao we may find in subsequent chapters of the Classic. For instance, in chap. 14, we have a restatement of the quite indefinable nature of Tao. 'Seeing you cannot perceive it, listening you cannot hear it, grasping at it you cannot catch it. In no one of these relations can it be brought to question. So in conflux they make one. Above, it is not bright.

Below, it is not dark. Everlasting it is, and cannot be named. It returns to nothingness. It is the form of the formless, the shape of the shapeless.' In the main this is simply an emphatic statement of the perfectly unqualified nature of Tao. The most interesting clause is this, 'It returns to nothingness.' Possibly we have here an adumbration of two ideas. First, the idea of a cyclical process through which Tao passes from perfect indefiniteness through definite things back to indefiniteness again. But I think that there is here also the hint of a process not physical but ideal. As we pursue Tao and try to imprison it in some definition, we find that it always eludes us and returns to nothingness. In short, while keeping in mind what has been said by the late Professor Wallace of Oxford, of the deceptive 'fluency with which modern conceptions insinuate themselves under the cover of ancient words,' I still venture to suggest that we have here something very like, something at least which suggests, the familiar Hegelian equation Pure Being = Nothing.

In chap. 40 we have another expression of the idea of process. 'Reversion is the movement of Tao. Weakness is the method of Tao. All things spring from existence: existence springs from non-existence.' Here, I think, we have unmistakably the idea of cyclical or reversionary process. Even more important is it to notice that we have here explicitly the idea that Tao, 'the mother of all things,' is in the last resort rather non-existence than existence.

We seek in vain in our Classic for any explanation of the progress—it were perhaps safer to say process—from Tao to things, from non-existence to existence. We have general statements such as that 'All things rely on Tao for birth' (34), and we have Tao described as 'nursing mother.' In this phrase we should perhaps see something more than the idea of 'origin.' Tao is not only that from which all things come, their 'mother'; Tao is also that by which all things subsist, their 'nursing mother.' Things are immediately dependent on Tao for their present existence. But of any definite cosmogony or statement of the stages of evolution we find no more than this (42), 'Tao produced one: one produced two: two produced three: three produced the world of things.' Commentators have vastly perplexed themselves in trying to explain the One, the Two, and the Three. The initial difficulty is this, that

whereas most of us would be content if we had traced the universe back to a single principle, the One, here Lao-tsze seems to push back to a previous stage, where he finds Tao. If, however, we remember what was said about existence issuing from non-existence, it will perhaps not seem unnatural to say that Tao, the very ultimate, is non-existence, and the One that Tao produces is existence. It is further quite natural, at least for a Chinaman, to see in the Two the Yin and the Yang, the negative and positive, the female and male principles which play such a large part in Chinese philosophy. The Three, however, remains a puzzle. After all, these discussions seem of little moment in determining the value of Lao-tsze's own system. If they have any interest it is only as they bear on the quite independent question of the relation between Taoism and later Chinese philosophy. Only, however we explain the One, the Two, and the Three, we must be on our guard against thinking that Lao-tsze is here interposing a chain of mediating agencies between Tao and this world of visible things. It is quite clear, I think, that in nature and its operations we are to see Tao. In the One, the Two, and the Three we may have the result of an analytical examination of things, the multiplicity of the world is seen to be reducible to three, to two, to one, to Tao. But though it is only at the end of our process of analysis that we come to Tao, we must not suppose that there is, as it were, any *spatial* interval between the proximate multiplicity (this world of things) and the ultimate Unity (Tao).

In chap. 21—a difficult chapter to interpret—we have some further hints of the relation between Tao and things. ‘Tao is vague and confused: how confused and vague it is! In it are forms. How vague and confused it is! In it are things. How deep, how dark! In it is essence. This essence is real. In it is truth.’ It has been suggested that we are to find here ‘something like the Platonic doctrine of ideas.’ I hardly think so. The ‘forms’ which are in Tao are not ideas in the Platonic sense. What we may gather from this chapter of Lao-tsze’s book is, I think, this—(1) that individual existences, the actual forms in which things are, originate in Tao; the world with all its specific determinations is to find its sole explanation in Tao; and (2) that Tao is the essence, the truth of things.

There is just one other passage which I should

like to bring to your notice before you make up your minds on the question ‘What is Tao?’ Speaking of Tao in chap. 4, Lao-tsze says: ‘I do not know whose son it is. It seems to be prior to Ti’ (i.e. God). This is to me one of the most significant utterances that we have with regard to Tao. It brings before us the relation between Taoism and the current religion of Lao-tsze’s time. We need not here describe that religion further than to say that it included a belief in a Supreme Ruler Ti, with subordinate spirits. Ti, or in more familiar phrase Shang Ti, is the Moral Governor of the universe with control over the forces of nature and the fortunes of men. So far as I know, his relation to the world is thought of as governmental only. Those questions of origin to which we seek an answer in the idea of Creation have not been raised. Now here we find Lao-tsze raising these ultimate questions, and saying that to him Tao seems to have preceded Ti. In other words, Tao seems to him more ultimate than God. Let us note exactly what this amounts to. Lao-tsze does not deny the existence of Ti, though it must be allowed that but for this one reference he completely ignores him. Lao-tsze does imply, however, that Ti, like every other definite existence, must find his explanation, the ground of his existence, in Tao. Ti, in short, just because he is conceived as one existence among many, God over against the world, does not explain himself. And yet as Lao-tsze finds himself driven back in thought behind this definite and limited God, so somehow he fails to find even in Tao a principle that quite explains itself. It is the ultimate term of his analysis, and yet with regard to it, too, the question arises, ‘Whence is it?’, only to be answered by the confession, ‘I do not know whose son it is.’ I cannot tell how it may strike others, but to myself there is something pathetic in this hesitating challenge of the popular belief, and bewildered halt on the utmost confines of thought.

(To be continued.)

# The Great Text Commentary.

## THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

### REVELATION XIV. 13.

'And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write. Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works follow with them.'

—R.V.

#### THE BEATITUDE OF THE DEAD.

**I. The occasion of the Beatitude.**—This Book of Revelation was written in a time of martyrdom—whether, as it was generally supposed, in the reign of the Emperor Domitian; or, according to the view recently favoured, a generation earlier and shortly after the persecution of Nero to which Peter and Paul fell victims, in the epoch which commenced with the burning of Rome and closed with the fall of Jerusalem, when the Roman Empire passed through the most terrible convulsions. St. John's vision is livid with the colours of an age of slaughter and devastation. 'Blood and fire and vapour of smoke' fill his strange pictures. You hear the groans of 'souls underneath the altar, slain for the word of God and the testimony which they held,' perpetually crying, 'Lord, how long?' You see them 'coming out of the great tribulation,' with blood-washed robes. 'Blood is given' for drink to those who have 'poured out the blood of saints and prophets, for they are worthy.'

Throughout these scenes of horror, in which the world's sin reaches its natural issue and judges itself by its fruits, the seer discerns the course of redemption and the victory of the Messianic kingdom; he watches the swift advance of Him who sits upon 'the white horse,' whose name is 'Faithful' and True,' and who 'in righteousness doth judge and war.' St. John's book is an apocalypse of fiery ruin for the corrupt and cruel powers of the earth that hate the Church of God and strive to drown her in blood, as they would fain have done her Lord; and it is an apocalypse of heavenly comfort to the afflicted and decimated flock of Christ. Amid its mighty thunderings, the sounding of its trumpet blasts, and the pouring out of its bowls full of the unmixed wrath of Almighty God, there comes this tender and consoling sound.

For a moment the storm ceases, the trumpets are hushed; a single, clear celestial voice is heard, like that which announced the glad tidings to the shepherds: 'Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.' With what soothing power this music of the angels came to the hearts of those first martyr-mourners, as hurriedly at night, stealing forth in timid bands, they gathered up the mangled forms of their dead recovered from the wild beasts in the arena or the executioner's axe, or haply left charred and half-consumed at the stake!<sup>1</sup>

**2. The Beatitude.**—There are seven Beatitudes in the Book of Revelation. Four of them are closely linked together and refer to the future glory of the Redeemed (14<sup>13</sup> 19<sup>9</sup> 20<sup>6</sup> 22<sup>14</sup>). This is the first of the four. The next is 'Blessed are they which are bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb' (19<sup>9</sup>). The allusion plainly is to our Lord's Parable of the Marriage Feast of the King's Son. The third is 'Blessed and holy is he which hath part in the first resurrection' (20<sup>6</sup>). The reference, says Dr. Findlay, is to the passage from death to life of the believing soul in this world. In Jn 5<sup>24</sup> Christ says, 'He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.' Then He continues, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.' The last of the four Beatitudes is in 22<sup>14</sup>: 'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' These four promises together give an enchanting view of the felicity of the dead in Christ.<sup>2</sup> Our text contains the first of the four. Take its words separately.

**i. Blessed.**—The Greek word thus translated means 'happy.' To most minds the more theological word 'blessed' does not convey so much meaning as the more familiar word 'happy.' Christ began the Sermon on the Mount with Beatitudes; so that the first word in the manifesto of the Kingdom of Heaven is the word 'happy.'

<sup>1</sup> G. G. Findlay, *The Things Above*, 170.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 161.

And it is a deliberate, vital, inevitable word. Christ could not have begun with any other word. He did not wish mainly to gain the world's ear, He came to solve the world's problem. And the world's problem is always a question of happiness. Accordingly, as Christ's first word was 'Happy' in the Sermon on the Mount, 'Happy' is His last word here in the Book of Revelation.<sup>1</sup>

Some time ago I saw in London one of the most tragic pictures ever painted. The last rough slope of a mountain leading to the edge of a precipice, at the foot of which one caught a misty glimpse of a graveyard. The slope, packed with a dense crowd of men and women, some in evening dress, some in the garb of toil, some in rags, all struggling to gain a foothold on the highest point, all of them tearing at and treading upon one another, all of them going upwards, where the filmy, beckoning, mocking figure of Pleasure floated out of reach. The picture was called, 'The Pursuit of Pleasure,' and in that grim, ghastly, sunless canvas the artist had not painted one happy face. Not a smile, not a flicker of gladness; nothing but fear, hatred, selfishness, and pain.<sup>2</sup>

*2. Blessed are the dead.*—This attitude to death is new. Hitherto it had been regarded in one of two ways.

(1) It was simply dreaded. This is the attitude of nature to death. Our great poet is her mouth-piece when he says:

The weariest and most loathed worldly life  
That age, ache, penury, and imprisonment  
Can lay on nature, is a paradise  
To what we fear of death.

That witness is true. Men may disclaim it or reason against it as they will: they are all their lifetime subject to bondage through fear of death.<sup>3</sup>

(2) But there was another attitude to death. Even pagans have called death blessed. Blessed, they said, are the dead, simply because being dead they are done with this life. The Hindu has given the most emphatic expression to this state of mind. If he believed in the transmigration of souls, it was not as a privilege to the good, but a punishment to the bad. The blessedness of the dead consisted in getting rid of this world, in having no more share in aught beneath the circle of the sun.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See P. C. Ainsworth, *The Blessed Life*, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 51.

<sup>3</sup> See G. G. Findlay, *The Things Above*, p. 167.

<sup>4</sup> See G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, p. 206.

But here the blessedness is not attributed to all the dead, only to the dead who die in the Lord.

*3. Who die in the Lord.*—It is no exaggeration to say that this phrase 'in the Lord,' or 'in Christ,' is the most important single phrase in the New Testament. It is the key to all the Epistles. Christ is imagined as a great Divine sphere, vast as the love and grace of God. He who by faith enters into that sphere crosses the line of circumference that separates a state of sin and condemnation from a state of justification and holiness. 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.'

But the phrase has two great interpretations. This redemptive interpretation is the first. The second is that the life of the believer is taken into the life of Christ, his work into Christ's work, his destiny into the destiny of Christ. So St. Paul says (Ro 14<sup>7-9</sup>), 'None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died, and lived again, that he might be Lord of both the dead and the living.'<sup>5</sup>

'In Christ' is a common expression to signify a condition of safety: 'He hath made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus'; 'And be found in him.' The old Methodist preacher, John Jones of Holywell, used to remark prettily on this latter word: 'When a doctor or lawyer changes his office, he puts a notice on the door or in the window, saying where the business is carried on. And so Paul here puts a notice in the old place he has left — "And to be found in him" henceforth!' 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' Having once been found in Christ, there is no going out any more—they 'die in the Lord.'<sup>6</sup>

This little preposition "in" signifies a vital union as distinguished from a superficial connection. The superficial connection with the Lord may be credal, or formal, or ecclesiastical, or denominational, and in all these there may be a fatal absence of all vital fellowship with the Lord. Vital union with Christ is essentially an incorporation. It is not a connection effected by some ecclesiastical knot, some denominational tie, some ritualistic ligament; it is the living union of the branch with the vine; it is a communion in whose mystic channels there flows the deepest life of men and God. It is a union so vital and so immediate that if Christ be alive the soul must live in Him.<sup>7</sup>

*4. From henceforth.*—This difficult expression has been explained in many different ways. (1) It

<sup>5</sup> See A. T. Pierson in *Christian World Pulpit*, xli. 82.

<sup>6</sup> D. Roberts, *A Letter from Heaven*, p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> J. H. Jowett, *Our Blessed Dead*, p. 14.

has been suggested that the reference is not to the bodily dead, but to those who are dead to sin. Blessed are the dead who are dying in the Lord (the participle is present) from henceforth. That is to say, hitherto those who became dead to the law through Christ have had to suffer persecution. But now the persecutor is himself to be destroyed; and from henceforth the condition of those who die with Christ will be a happy one, being free from tyranny and torment.<sup>1</sup>

And there is no doubt that, as Swete says, the message in the first instance is for a particular age, and that it is an encouragement to those who were being called to suffer for their faith. But on the other hand it must be admitted that this is not the natural interpretation of the words 'who die in the Lord.' There remain two explanations worth considering.

(2) It is suggested that from this time forth a change actually takes place in the condition of departed believers. This is how the change is expressed by Canon F. C. Cook: 'The state of good men who died before the coming of Christ appears to me to be always spoken of in the Old Testament as one of true, but very imperfect, blessedness; a period, not indeed of unconsciousness, but of dim expectation. It was scarcely looked forward to with joy by those who trusted confidently in the power and love of God. At the best they would but be "prisoners of hope" still, waiting for their appointed change—for the morning which, after an unknown length of night, would usher in the day of restoration. But when Christ came, when He had accomplished His work, when the blood was shed which atoned for all repented guilt, when His body had hallowed the grave, when His Spirit had burst the bars of the pit and preached to the spirits in Hades, a mighty change was effected—light shone into the pit, the prison became a palace. The future restoration, though not as yet effected, was anticipated; and while all the great spirits of old, who in darkness and trembling had passed into the shadow of death, were filled with a new joy, henceforth all who departed hence in union with Jesus, entered at once into a state of conscious blessedness, knowing, like St. Paul, that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord—present with Him in no dim visionary region, but present in Paradise.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See H. Crosby, in *The Homiletic Review*, xiv. 37.

<sup>2</sup> F. C. Cook, *Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life*, p. 168.

(3) The third method is to treat the words 'from henceforth' as referring, not to a new condition in the state of the dead, but to a new revelation of that condition.

It is not, says Dr. Matheson, that from henceforth the dead are to be more blessed, but that from henceforth we are to *think* of them as more blessed. It is the proclaiming of a new revelation on the subject, which is to be incorporated for the future with the sum of human knowledge. To the Old Testament Hebrew the dead were not blessed. Death was a penalty; the state of the dead was undesirable. His hope for the departed was that they would come back again. But the devout Christian believer does not wish to bring back his dead. They have departed to be with Christ, and he knows that that is very far better.<sup>3</sup>

Which of these interpretations is the true one? Probably the third. This is the climax of a series of revelations, and, as Swete says, it needed a Voice from heaven to proclaim it. St. Paul, speaking by revelation (1 Co 15<sup>18</sup>), had taught that the dead in Christ were not to be the subjects of a hopeless grief. St. John (Rev 6<sup>9</sup>) had 'seen the souls of the martyrs under the Altar crying, How long?' and had heard them bidden to rest awhile. This Voice carries these revelations a step further. Those who should die in the Lord henceforth, as the martyrs did, were to be happy because of the rest on which they entered and the works which followed them into it.

When Mrs. Browning died, her husband wrote—and the words are doubly impressive when one remembers how wonderfully close had been their attachment (for years they never had a meal apart)—'God took her to Himself as you would lift a sleeping child from a dark, uneasy bed into your arms and the light.'

3. The Response.—'Yea, saith the Spirit.' The Spirit in the mind of the Seer responds to the Voice from above him. Yea, he answers, they are blessed, to rest (as they shall) from their labours.<sup>4</sup> The Voice said, 'Write'—that is, the voice of God as it sounded from above; and the Spirit said, 'Yea'—that is, the spirit of inspiration and obedience, as it answered from within, ever keen to discern the heavenly revelations, and prompt to perform the heavenly will. That is the picture presented us here,—a something that discloses, and a something that assents,—the announcement

<sup>3</sup> See G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, p. 204.

<sup>4</sup> H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, *in loc.*

of an objective truth, and the presence and the sympathy of a subjective response. It is the same still. For a divinely-appointed plan there must be a divinely-wrought acquiescence. Deep must call unto deep,—the deep of a God that reveals to the deep of a God that complies. Whosoever the Divine voice speaks, and whatsoever the Divine voice says, whether it be, ‘This write,’ or ‘This believe,’ ‘This do,’ or ‘This suffer,’ the Spirit within men may answer ‘Yea,’ and no answer is acceptable save the ‘yea’ which the Spirit returns.<sup>1</sup>

In making this response the Spirit within the Prophet gave two reasons for the blessedness of the dead in Christ: (1) they rest from their labours; (2) their works go with them. These two great reasons are not revealed from without. They are the Seer’s own discovery. And yet they are not his own, but are made to him by the Mind of Christ now dwelling in him.

1. *Rest from labour*.—‘They rest from their labours.’ The Greek word (*κόποι*) has invariably the sense of trying and distressing labours, exertions which, whether effectual or not, involve a painful strain, efforts often baffled, ever-exhausting, ever reminding us of the condition into which man falls when he deliberately sets his own will against God’s will.<sup>2</sup> Even after forgiveness, even after the Christian escapes from the dominion of sin, sin is still there. It meets him everywhere; he is never safe from it. He is pained by its contact; he is humbled by its force; he is grieved by its outbreak. Work is joy; but labour is work’s distress. The law of work has its dark shadows—fatigue, infirmity, too great tension, ill-health, disappointments, mistakes, waitings, suspensions, sins. There is the miserable depressing sense of inadequacy for the task; there is the perplexity of what is the line of duty; there are all the entanglements of self. The Greek word has for its root the verb to *cut*; labour cuts to the heart.<sup>3</sup>

They that sleep in the Lord rest from such labours. They rest (1) from the *toil* of labour. They rest (2) from the *woe* of labour. They rest (3) from the *faults* of labour. They rest (4) from the *discouragements* of labour. And they rest (5) from the *disappointments* of labour.<sup>4</sup>

At the very heart of this word ‘labours,’ says Mr. Jowett, there is a sense of faintness and exhaustion. It is a word of burdensomeness, wan and drooping, like a stricken plant. The outstanding significance of the word is not the work, but the weariness of the work. Yes, it is a tired word which has lost its spring! ‘And Jesus, being *wearied* with his journey!’ There you have it, the identical word, carrying the sense of ‘spentness,’ of limitation, of exhaustion. And, therefore, when we are told that ‘the dead in Christ’ ‘rest from their labours,’ we are not to take it as meaning that they rest from their work, but from the weariness of work, which is a far nobler emancipation. To take away the faintness is infinitely more gracious than to take us out of the crusade. The redemption of our blessed dead is redemption from tiredness, redemption from the limitations which arise from small capital; it is redemption from the drooping and the withering; it is entry into the tireless life.

There everlasting spring abides,  
And never-withering flowers!

That is the word which carries the grace of the evangel—‘never-withering’—the land where the inhabitants never say, ‘I am sick.’ And so we might very accurately paraphrase the familiar sentence in our Beatitude as follows: ‘They rest from the laboriousness of labour,’ and great services become their native delight. ‘They serve Him day and night in His temple.’<sup>5</sup>

It is not difficult to name some of the things which make present labour so laboursome, and from which the blessed dead have found their freedom. There are the *limitations of the body*. We so soon begin to encroach upon our physical capital, and the labouring body becomes a drag upon the eager spirit. ‘The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.’ Even the evangelization of the world must tarry while ‘Jesus, being wearied, sat thus by the well.’ How much more we could presumably do for the kingdom if the vital flame did not so speedily shudder and flicker down into its socket! But it is evident that here our very tiredness is a necessary factor in the campaign, and that the frailty of the body is the mysterious servant of the spirit. But our blessed dead ‘drop the robe of flesh,’ because its ministry is ended, and ‘they rest from the labour’ and travail of physical infirmity.

But there is a second element of laboriousness which burdens our temporal service, and that is the seeming fruitlessness of present labour. We toil at the wilderness for years, and it appears a wilderness still. And because

<sup>1</sup> W. A. Gray, *The Shadow of the Hand*, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> F. C. Cook, *Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life*, p. 169.

<sup>3</sup> J. Vaughan, *Brighton Pulpit*, Ser. 544.

<sup>4</sup> C. H. Spurgeon, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 384.

<sup>5</sup> J. H. Jowett, *Our Blessed Dead*, p. 19.

we cannot see flowers and fruits we become despondent about growth. Because we are not always seeing results we become dubious about processes. And we grow faint and weary, and the song goes out of our work, and the gay service becomes a humdrum task. Such despair is ever our peril, but it need never be our necessity. There have been men who have toiled and toiled at their desert-patch, and even when no green blade has appeared to cheer the grim waste they have 'endured as seeing Him who is invisible.' But, apart from this, we have not the eyes as yet to see the sure ministries of spiritual processes going on in the secret place. Our eyes are holden, there are necessary veils, earth-clouds form about us, and 'we walk by faith, and not by sight.' But our blessed dead, when they pass behind the veil, become superior to the veil, and every veil becomes transparent. They look 'with other eyes than ours,' they see the first awakenings of mighty destinies, they trace the river from its spring, they 'know even as also they are known,' they have the open vision, and they rest from the laboriousness of uncertain service.

And there is one further element in the burdensomeness of present labours, and that is *our broken correspondence with God*. God is not always real enough to be impressive. Sometimes He seems so gloriously real and immediate that the intervening veil is only like a bridal-veil, and we can almost see His face! 'In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord.' But the alien season returns, and the bridal-veil becomes a fog, and the soul cries out, 'Oh that I knew where I might find Him!' And the seeming nearness or distance of the Lord makes all the difference to the buoyancy or the weariness of our work. But our blessed dead know neither bridal-veil nor fog. They have died into the open glory, into the fellowship where there is no night, the land of which 'the Lamb is the light thereof,' and where service is always in the sunshine, 'and sorrow and sighing have passed away.' They see God, and they rest from the laboriousness of broken communion.<sup>1</sup>

**2. Resumption of Work.**—There is a contrast between the two words 'labours' and 'works.' The labours of the saintly life end in the grave, but not its works; its processes, methods, habits, results, remain, and follow the saint into his new life. The Greek is literally 'they rest from their labours; *for* their works follow with them.' The contrast, says Swete, is latent in the 'for': 'they shall rest from their labours—I say not from their works, for their works go with them.' 'In his own redeemed spirit,' says Findlay, 'in his chastened and ripened character, the dying Christian takes with him the essential part of his life's work. The residue will follow in those who follow him as he followed Christ, in those whom his teaching and his example have led into the way of peace, in the souls saved, the lives uplifted and purified, by his life and words.'

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Jowett, *Our Blessed Dead*, p. 22.

But the thought may be broken up into two parts.

(1) Their works follow with them. That is, as Dr. Findlay suggests, the works they do here are permanently theirs. They are accepted by God, and rewarded by Him. 'The saints,' says Jowett, 'enter the land of glory like monarchs with princely retinues. Their retinue is the radiant assemblage of good works which they have done in their pilgrimage through time.'

To many a humble saint there will be a moment of wondering thankfulness when he sees these his 'children whom God hath given him' clustered round him, and has to say, 'Lord, when saw I thee naked, or in prison, and visited thee?' There will be many an apocalypse of grateful surprise in the revelations of the heavens. We remember Milton's noble explanation of these great words which may well silence our feeble attempts to enforce them:

Thy works and alms and all thy good endeavour  
Stood not behind, nor in the grave were trod,  
But as faith pointed with her golden rod,  
Followed them up to joy and bliss for ever.

So then, life here and yonder will for the Christian soul be one continuous whole, only that there, while 'their works do follow them,' 'they rest from their labours.'<sup>2</sup>

Carlyle quotes the text at the close of his description of Cromwell's death, and says, 'Their works follow them.' As, I think, this Oliver Cromwell's works have done, and are still doing! We have had our 'Revolutions of Eighty-Eight' officially called 'glorious,' and other Revolutions not yet called glorious; and somewhat has been gained for poor mankind. Men's ears are not now slit off by rash officiality; officiality will, for long henceforth, be more cautious about men's ears. . . . Oliver's works do follow him! The works of a man, bury them under what guano-mountains and obscene owl-droppings you will, do not perish, cannot perish. What of Heroism, what of Eternal Light, was in a man and his life, is with very great exactness added to the Eternities; remains for ever a new divine portion of the sum of things; and no owl's voice, this way or that, in the least avails in the matter.<sup>3</sup>

2. The other thought is that they resume in glory the work which they have been doing here, but which has been interrupted for a moment by death. They who die in the Lord are not in a state of dim unconsciousness, nor merely in a state of ecstatic trance, visited by gleams of heavenly splendour, or visions of a more glorious hereafter; they are in a state of action, doing works which differ from their works in this life mainly in that the element of struggle, of painful effort, of an all-but perpetual sense of failure and disappointment, is withdrawn,

<sup>2</sup> A. Maclaren, *Expositions of Holy Scripture*.

<sup>3</sup> *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, by T. Carlyle, p. 375.

and replaced by a sabbatic rest—a rest not of idleness or vacuity, but of unbroken, untroubled action.<sup>1</sup>

Is it a fantastic speculation, then, to imagine that the rest of the other world, while a rest from worry, will be a rest not *from* work, but a rest *in* work, the doing of work which it is a joy to do, and which is the reward of all honest effort, which gives full scope not only for such facilities as you have acquired here in the service of your Lord, but for all the pure energies which were checked and hampered here by the body, by circumstances, by the worries of our mortal life?

And I shall thereupon  
Take rest, ere I be gone

Once more on my adventure brave and new:

Fearless and unperplexed,  
When I wage battle next,

What weapons to select, what armour to indeu.<sup>2</sup>

I recently heard a story, well authenticated, regarding the late G. F. Watts, the great painter, which beautifully illustrates the thought as we have it in the Revised Version: 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord . . . that they may rest from their labours, for their works follow with them,'—the thought here being, surely, that the rest of the blessed dead will be the full satisfaction of their natures in God's presence hereafter on *the lines of their toil and aspiration here*. A distinguished living musician met Watts when the latter was well advanced in years. The two were congenial spirits, and became fast friends. The great master of music spoke to Watts, the master of a sister art, of a curious fact illustrating the kinship of the beautiful in all spheres, namely, that if a line be drawn through the written notes of a perfect melody, it will take the form of a perfect curve. Watts was intensely interested. Some time later the great Christian artist passed away, and his friend received a letter from a near relative of the deceased painter in which he recalled the conversation about the beautiful curves. It would interest the musician to know, the letter said, that Watts, just before his death, when he had sunk into a state of unconsciousness at length opened his eyes, and exclaimed, 'I have seen the Almighty, and the curves are all right!'

<sup>1</sup> F. C. Cook, *Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life*, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> E. B. Spiers, *A Present Advent*, p. 189.

#### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. A. R. Howell, M.A., Manse

of Kincardine, Perthshire, to whom a copy of Wilson's *How God has Spoken* has been sent, and the Rev. F. V. Pratt, M.A., Augaston, S. Australia, to whom a copy of Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for February must be received by the 1st of January. The text is Rev 20<sup>12</sup>.

The Great Text for March is Rev 21<sup>1</sup>—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more.' A copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, or Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Forrest's *Christ of History and of Experience*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for April is Rev 21<sup>5</sup>—'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Holborn's *Architectures of European Religions*, or Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for May is Rev 21<sup>27</sup>—'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, or of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev 22<sup>3.4</sup>—'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministrant of the Holy Spirit*, or Lecky's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

## Luke of Antioch in Pisidia.

BY THE REV. W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.D., PRESTON.

They returned to Lystra, and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting [them] to continue in the faith, and that through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God.—AC 14<sup>21, 22</sup>.

THE 'we-passages' in the Book of Acts have often been studied to outline the history of their author; but Acts 14<sup>22</sup>, the earliest of them, has generally been left out of the group, although Alford, Lumby, and others have, with hesitation, inferred that Luke accompanied Paul on his first journey. The purpose of this paper is to advocate the theory that Luke was actually converted at Pisidian Antioch on that journey.

First, we observe that the word [them] is not warranted by the Greek, though neither of our versions prints it in italic; from the context we ought to supply [us]. From the occurrence of the *ημᾶς* we must infer, as in similar passages, that Luke was a disciple at Lystra, or Iconium, or Antioch. The alternative is that he clumsily dovetails into his narrative a short quotation verbatim. Of such a literary procedure by Luke there is no other instance, nor is there any apparent reason for its occurrence here. It is true that a few instances may be found of change from indirect to direct quotation, as often in Greek; but comparing Lk 5<sup>14</sup>, Ac 1<sup>4</sup> 17<sup>8</sup> 23<sup>22</sup>, all fail to show the peculiarity here, that the transition is to the first person, not the second. They show that Luke could alternately summarize and quote, not that he interpolates into a summary a phrase written from the standpoint of neither speaker nor recorder, but hearer.

Second, we turn to the report of the previous address at Antioch (Ac 13<sup>16-41</sup>), and again find traces of an ear-witness. It is the longest report of any speech by Paul, the only other to compare with it is that before Festus, which was certainly heard by Luke (Ac 27<sup>1</sup>). Now, for this long report there is no reason in the occasion, or the town, or the speech, or the speaker. There was nothing crucial in the occasion: Paul had been working in synagogues for fourteen years, and in most there would be Gentile sympathizers, as was notorious at Antioch in Syria; the address was

delivered at the invitation of the rulers, as usual; it went upon Jewish lines; it was not a turning point as if it was the last ever delivered under such conditions, for at Iconium shortly afterwards, he spoke again in the synagogue. There was nothing remarkable about the town; it was only a Roman colony, of respectable size, and perhaps the most important in Galatia, but hardly more important than Salamis and Paphos, evangelized on the same journey. It will not compare with Syrian Antioch, Ephesus, or Corinth. Luke records no speech delivered by Paul at these ancient capitals where he worked for years, and Luke was not present when Paul opened his campaigns at them; does not this suggest why he made an exception for Pisidian Antioch? If it be rejoined that he made another for the address at Lystra on this same journey, there are two good reasons; this was a typical address to Jews, that a typical address to Gentiles; the latter was in a town whence came Timothy, Luke's frequent companion, whose minute knowledge can be traced in the notices of Lystra, while those of Iconium and Derbe are general. There was nothing remarkable about the speech, which is on the same general lines as that of Peter at Pentecost, an argument on Jewish premises that the Messiah was come in the person of Jesus. There was nothing special about the speaker. Paul was 'certainly the chief speaker, but the dramatic reversal of rôles had taken place at Paphos; where Barnabas had fallen to the rear. If, then, neither the occasion nor the town nor the speech nor the speaker will account for the lengthy report, must we not suppose some reason personal to the reporter?

This is confirmed by a few difficulties in the address. The chronology of the Judges' period and of Saul's reign, the fusion of quotations at 13<sup>22</sup>, have made Alford and Knowling conclude that the speech is reported verbatim, for a revision or condensation would have made these rough

places smooth. So both from the length and from the peculiarities natural with an oral address reported faithfully, we may infer an ear-witness.

Third, there are a few traits in the context that indicate an eye-witness. There is a delicate shade in the word ἀλθόντες at 13<sup>14</sup>. Six other times Luke mentions people entering a synagogue; on these occasions he was absent, and he uses other words. The variation at this place harmonizes with the theory that he was already seated in that synagogue when they entered.

Again, if we compare his story of Christ speaking at Nazareth, we observe that there was no mention then of more than one reading, or of the ruler sending an invitation to speak, and that our Lord sat down for the address, while Paul in this place stood for the purpose. The details, which are given in the Gospel, few as they are, are more numerous than those in Matthew and Mark; that may be due to a Gentile describing foreign customs to a Gentile; the incidental mention of differences here is surely due to an observer.

Similarly we read that Paul beckoned with the hand. This gesture is mentioned by Luke three times more, and by him alone. Peter thus silenced the prayer-meeting in the house of Mary, mother of John Mark; the latter was probably Luke's informant (Ac 12<sup>17</sup>). Alexander tried thus to obtain silence in the theatre of Ephesus (Ac 19<sup>33</sup>); 1 Co 16 shows that Timothy was there, about to pass through Philippi, where his friend Luke was staying. Paul thus secured silence in the temple-court, where Luke possibly was standing (Ac 21<sup>40, 18</sup>). Considering the three people thus mentioned, we cannot assume that the gesture was characteristic of Paul. Neither can we dismiss the phrase as a mere flourish of Luke's rhetoric. He records other speeches at third or fourth hand, four of Peter and one of Stephen, and makes only such a general remark as that he 'opened his mouth.' And when he has to report Paul at Athens, or saying good-bye at Ephesus, or defending himself before the Sanhedrin and Felix, there is no word of this gesture. But before Festus it is noted that Paul stretched forth his hand, and the mention by the apostle of his bonds confirms the accuracy of Luke the eye-witness. It seems, then, most reasonable to suppose that at Pisidian Antioch also Luke saw and noted the movement.

It would certainly have been possible to expect other traces of his presence, as that vv. 43, 48

should have read, 'Many of the Jews and of the devout proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas, who speaking to us, urged us to continue in the grace of God. . . . And as the Gentiles heard this, we were glad,' etc. But without any plea from modesty or from grammar, we may say that Luke is strictly accurate, and that he was not, and did not claim to be, one of the first converts there. That he was converted before their departure is, however, additionally probable from the remark that the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit, which seems rather more personal and experimental than the colourless summaries at Lk 24<sup>52</sup>, Ac 9<sup>31</sup> 12<sup>24</sup>.

Comparing these touches with the meagre account of the long and successful work at Iconium, the short but graphic account of the doings at Lystra seen by Timothy, and the one line about Derbe, there seems further probability in the theory that Luke was actually present in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch.

The full description of the conference at Jerusalem (Ac 15) is the more natural if Luke was one of those very Gentiles whose future was trembling in the balance, and whose conversion was described by Barnabas and Paul. The speech of Peter, with its reference to the Law as a yoke that could not be borne, would specially interest a man whose Church in Galatia had a letter from Paul mentioning his expostulation with Peter as not himself keeping the Law. The general information could easily be acquired by Luke when he stayed at Jerusalem with Mnason and met James; the text of the apostolic letter was delivered at Pisidian Antioch by Paul and Silas on the second journey.

The silence about the town on this occasion accords with Luke's custom of narrating the breaking of new ground, but not the subsequent steps of consolidation, unless there was something critical. This there was in the circumcision of Timothy, as was seen by the subsequent misunderstandings in the Galatian Churches. But Pisidian Antioch is passed over as briefly as the churches in Syria and Cilicia, or as those in Macedonia on the third journey (Ac 20<sup>1-5</sup>). After passing Pisidian Antioch on this second journey, Paul's party wandered silently through Asia, and Luke did not join them till Troas (Ac 16<sup>6-10</sup>). Young Timothy had no ties to delay him, but a physician would need a little time to decide on throwing up his practice and

arranging his affairs. From Antioch it was easy to reach Troas.

Ramsay has shown that Luke's allusions to the geography of Asia Minor are singularly accurate. But the allusions are restricted. Tarsus and Cilicia are barely mentioned, and the same is the case with Pamphylia, Mysia, and Bithynia; in Asia we only have recorded the stoppages of a company of pilgrims in which Luke travelled. His minute allusions are to the cities of Lycaonia and the region of Galatian Phrygia, exactly the district in which Pisidian Antioch was a chief town. The same detailed accuracy is to be seen in the references to Macedonia, where admittedly Luke laboured, while his geographical references to Achaia are not minute, though accurate. Such facts give further probability that Luke knew well 'the region which was called Phrygian geographically and Galatic politically.'

It may be worth mentioning that Paul's first presence in Pisidian Antioch was due to an infirmity of the flesh, so that his meeting a physician there was very desirable. But we may not insist on Luke's presence in the great company bearing

money to Jerusalem. Gaius of Derbe and Timothy could represent all Galatia, and no other representative of Philippi is hinted at, unless it be Luke, who had stayed there on the second journey, and rejoined Paul there on the third.

Certainly he is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, but that is not extraordinary. He was not an elder (Ac 14<sup>22, 23</sup>); no Galatian at all is mentioned; he was not with Paul when the letter was written; indeed, Ramsay thinks that the letter was penned before Luke came into any close connexion with Paul.

The only letters that do mention Luke were sent to the Colossians and to Timothy at Ephesus, to the province of Asia, whence a high-road ran through Pisidian Antioch, and to a man from another Galatian town.

There seems, then, no reason to be gleaned from the New Testament against the theory that Luke first met Paul at this colony in Galatia, and that he was converted on the outward half of the first journey. Many trifling touches confirm it, and the language of Luke himself implies it in his usual modest fashion, but plainly.

## In the Study.

### A Study in the Sphere of Supposition.

THE latest volume of sermons by the Rev. G. H. Morrison, M.A., is called *The Return of the Angels* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). The last sermon in it is called 'The Sphere of Supposition.' Mr. Morrison has taken the word 'supposing' out of three places in which it is found in the New Testament, and made it the subject of his sermon.

It is a manner of preaching that is not so common as it might be. The objection to it is that it is so easy. But when trouble is taken with it, as Mr. Morrison takes trouble, there is no manner of preaching that is at once so interesting and so edifying. It has the interest of variety; it has the edification of systematic theological instruction.

Mr. Morrison's word is 'supposing.' It is not a strong word. It is not the word of strong people. 'I suppose so'—but why do you not think? why do you not find out?

I. The first text is Lk 2<sup>44</sup>—'Supposing him to have been in the company.' It is taken from the story of the visit of Jesus to the Temple when He was a boy. It is a story of singular charm. It is both natural and supernatural. There are other stories of His infancy, but they are only supernatural, and therefore incredible.

When the Feast was over, Joseph and Mary turned home again. They were with their friends. It was a large company. And, 'supposing that Jesus was in the company' also, they went a day's journey. They were a little to blame. They should have found out. But do we not ourselves sometimes suppose that we have what we have not? Do we not sometimes suppose that we have Christ?

Where is He? He is about the Father's business. He is always about the Father's business. We can therefore always tell whether we have Him or not. We have Him if we also are about the Father's business. If we are not about the Father's business, we have Him not.

And if we have not Christ, we have not the things of Christ, however we may think we have them. That is the point which Mr. Morrison makes. 'We think that what yesterday we loved and cherished is still in the circle of our life today. And we know not that in secret it has left us, and stolen away from our side on feet of wool, and onward we move unconscious of our loss, supposing it is still in our company. The fact is,' says Mr. Morrison, 'that all we ever gained has to be kept with an unceasing vigilance.' There is an anecdote in the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*, another of the books of the month, 'I was once sitting in a room where I had to wait for half an hour before a meeting, and by the fire was sitting a poorly clad, rather wretched-looking, old man, gently moaning at intervals. I asked him if anything was the matter, and he said, "No—I was only just thinking what a deal of trouble it takes to get the world right and to keep it right." Yes, it takes trouble.'

2. The second text is Jn 20<sup>15</sup>—'She, supposing him to be the gardener.' It is again taken from a charming story, a story mingled of the natural and the supernatural. It was the morning of the Resurrection, and Mary Magdalene had come early to the tomb. She found it empty. It was a surprise and a great shock to her. Did art invent the surprise and the shock? Did art invent the angels? She saw two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. 'Woman, why weepest thou?' they asked. She answered, 'Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.' Then she heard a movement in the grass. She turned round, and Jesus was at her side. But she, supposing Him to be the gardener—

We suppose Him to be the gardener still. A working man, we say. And we feel so religious as we say it. Here is something from another book of the month, from a remarkable book, *The Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, by Henry W. Clark (Robert Scott). 'They are everlastingly drawing pictures,' says Mr. Clark, 'of the Christ in which the mere outward frame, as it were (wherein He was one of us), is correctly given, but wherefrom all sign of that inner light of infinite holiness (which stamps Him as coming from a world we never saw) has been left out; and the loud-mouthed demagogues are ever proclaiming that

most grotesque of all modern gospels, that Christ was a working man.'

He *was* a working man. But when we have said it, what have we said? Can a working man save us? Was it a working man that endured the cross, despising the shame? Was it a working man that felt the joy that was set before Him? He *was* a working man; but one evening He laid His tools aside for the last time and went out to save the world.

That evening, when the Carpenter swept out  
The fragrant shavings from the workshop floor,  
And placed the tools in order, and shut to  
And barred for the last time the humble door,  
And, going on His way to save the world,  
Turned from the labourer's lot for evermore,  
I wonder, was He glad?

That morning, when the Carpenter walked forth  
From Joseph's cottage, in the glimmering light,  
And bade His holy mother long farewell;  
And through the skies of dawn, all pearly bright,  
Saw glooming the dark shadow of a cross,  
Yet, seeing, set His feet towards Calvary's height,  
I wonder, was He sad?

Ah! when the Carpenter went on His way  
He thought not for Himself of good or ill.  
His path was one through shop or thronging men  
Craving His help, e'en to the cross-crowned hill,  
In toiling, healing, loving, suffering—all  
His joy and life to do His Father's will,  
And earth and heaven are glad!

And is there not the danger that we may make this mistake with others also? Is it not possible that we may misunderstand a neighbour—supposing him to be the gardener. That is Mr. Morrison's point here. 'We have lived with them,' he says, 'and seen their faults and failings, and think we have gauged them in their strength and weakness. Then unexpectedly there comes an hour to them when they are called to do or suffer in the heroic way, and in that hour it is farewell for ever to our pitiful estimates of yesterday.'

3. The third text is Ac 16<sup>27</sup>—'Supposing that the prisoners had been fled.' The story has not the idyllic charm of the other two. For Luke is not so fascinating as a writer when he relates the deeds of the Apostles as when he relates that

which Jesus began to do and teach. But it is a graphic account of one of the most memorable incidents in history.

Paul and Silas, having deprived some men of the gains they got by exploiting a poor demented woman, were thrust into prison and their feet were made fast in the stocks. But at midnight they prayed and sang praises. Then their chains fell off and the prison doors flew open. Again it is a combination of the natural and the supernatural. The jailer was roused out of his sleep, and drew his sword to kill himself, ‘supposing that the prisoners had been fled.’

But he did not know the nature of the prisoners he had. He never had Christians in his cells before, and he did not know how they were likely to behave. ‘Do thyself no harm; for we are all here.’

And even yet, even when Christianity is so familiar as a profession and a practice, men of the world suppose that Christians will act as they would act themselves. They try to ‘give as much as they get,’ and when a Christian turns the other cheek, they suspect some simplicity or cunning. They do not even understand the language of Christianity. There is an amusing story in the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*. But it is a story with plenty of the tragedy of life in it also. A wife was once complaining to a clergyman of her husband’s unsatisfactory conduct. ‘You should heap coals of fire on his head,’ he said. To which she replied, ‘Well, I tried boiling water, and that did no good!’

The world does not understand the very language of Christianity. It is surprised and puzzled with the conduct of Christians. But, says Mr. Morrison, it is the unexpected that is the charm of the follower of Christ.

## Studies in Failure.

### I.

#### The Many and the Few.

Mt 22<sup>14</sup>, ‘Many are called, but few are chosen.’

**I.** There is nothing that receives more attention on earth than failure and success. The newspapers are mostly occupied either with the advantages obtained by those who succeed, or with the misfortunes of those who fail. And even the

great philosophy of our day—that philosophy, called Darwinism, which has revolutionized thought in almost every department of knowledge—is based on the observation of success and failure. Its very title is ‘The Struggle for Existence, and the Survival of the Fittest.’

And the fittest are the few. So says Darwinism, and so says the Bible. Of all upon whom the Flood came, ‘few, that is, eight persons were saved.’ Of all the inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain, only Lot and his two daughters escaped the destruction. Of the vast multitude who left Egypt for the Land of Promise, only two, Caleb and Joshua, entered into possession of it.<sup>1</sup> For many are called, but few are chosen.

It is not a matter of election, at least not yet. The calling is the invitation to the marriage feast. The words are found at the close of the Parable of the Labourers, but their place is not there. Their place is at the end of the Parable of the Feast which the king gave on the occasion of the marriage of his son. Of the many who were invited to that feast, only the few accepted the invitation. It is simply that fact, at first. And the fact is seen in every department of life—few accept, and many refuse.

The word ‘remnant,’ says Newman, is frequent with the prophets, from whom St. Paul takes it. Isaiah, for instance, says, ‘Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved.’ Jeremiah speaks of ‘the remnant of Judah,’ and the ‘small number,’ to which a return was promised. Ezekiel, too, declares that God ‘will leave a remnant,’ ‘that ye may have some,’ continues the divine oracle, ‘that shall escape the sword among the nations, when ye shall be scattered through the countries. And they that escape of you shall remember me among the nations, whither they shall be carried captives.’ And so well understood was this, that the hope of good men never reached beyond it. Neither the promise, on the one hand, nor the hope, on the other, ever goes beyond the prospect of a remnant being saved. Thus the consolation given to the Church in the Book of Jeremiah is, that God ‘will not make a full end; and Ezra, confessing the sins of his people, expresses his dread lest there should be ‘no remnant.’ Thus Christ, His Apostles, and His Prophets, all teach the same

<sup>1</sup> See R. H. McKim, *The Gospel in the Christian Year*, 137.

doctrine, that the chosen are few, though many are called : that one gains the prize, though many run the race.<sup>1</sup>

To every thoughtful person, the most perplexing of all problems is the apparent waste of human life, the comparative failure of the gospel of Christ to regenerate the world. If I might speak for myself, I should say that I find no difficulties at all in religion compared to this.

When I pass through the streets of a great city, when I am in the midst of the thronging crowds of London, or when I try to realize to myself the teeming millions of human beings in India or in China, when I think of the innumerable multitude who are outside all religious influences whatever, or when I remember the myriads of those who have heard of Christ, who have listened to His gracious invitations, and yet are still so unmoved, so careless, so worldly, so wrapped up in their business and their pleasure, apparently so regardless of the unseen, the spiritual, and the eternal ; when all this is borne in upon my soul, I do feel that other difficulties pale into insignificance compared with them. Sure I am that it is this seeming waste of human life, of the individual life, which weighs most heavily upon the souls of those who think and feel for their brother-men ; it is this thought which wrings the almost despairing, the pathetic cry from our great modern poet, as he contemplates it in nature—

So careful of the type she seems,  
So careless of the single life ;

That I, considering everywhere  
Her secret meaning in her deeds,  
And finding that of fifty seeds  
She often brings but one to bear,

I falter where I firmly trod,  
And, falling with my weight of cares  
Upon the great world's altar stairs  
That slope through darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,  
And gather dust and chaff, and call  
To what I feel is Lord of all,  
And faintly trust the larger hope.<sup>2</sup>

2. But what is success ? There is material, intellectual, or moral success.

1. Success is material. It is making money, a position ; it is 'getting on in the world.' Few get on in the world. And it is not for the want of direction. There are innumerable books, written mostly for young men, which contain the rules for getting on in the world. One of them<sup>3</sup> reduces the rules to these five—Push, Tact, Faith, Grit, Skill. The aim is obvious. The very words are worldly. For 'faith' here is simply venture. The man who is to succeed must sometimes take risks. Yet if he

is to get on in a worldly-wise manner, he will reduce the chance of mistake as much as possible ; he is advised to look well before he leaps. But with all encouragement, only the few succeed. Take the unassailable evidence of Professor Mackenzie's *Manual of Ethics*:<sup>4</sup> 'Those who fix their attention on the lives of individuals have always sufficient ground for Pessimism. Even the most favoured human beings attain only a small part of what they hope ; and what they hope is generally but a small part of what they would wish to be able to hope. And a large proportion of the human race scarcely seem to get the length of hope at all.'

2. Success is intellectual. Turn again to Professor Mackenzie, 'Conscious of the failure of life and society, many of the finest natures have taken refuge in Art. Matthew Arnold, in one of the most striking of his poems,<sup>5</sup> represents Goethe as turning from the vain strife of his age, after having exposed its weaknesses, and proclaiming to his contemporaries as their last resort—"Art still has truth, take refuge there." But what does Goethe say at the end of it? "I will say nothing," he writes in 1824, "against the course of my existence. But at bottom it has been nothing but pain and burden, and I can affirm that during the whole of my seventy-five years, I have not had four weeks of genuine well-being. It is but the perpetual rolling of a rock that must be raised up again for ever."<sup>6</sup>

Intellectually, Goethe had been one of the few who succeed. Their number is less than the number of those who succeed materially. But even when intellectual success is obtained, it does not seem to be always satisfying.

3. Success is moral. This is what Professor Mackenzie comes to. 'Men may seek a temporary relief in Art,' he says, 'from the struggle of life ; and it may be a not unworthy commendation to say of a great poet—

The cloud of mortal destiny,  
Others will front it fearlessly—  
But who, like him, will put it by?

But even this service can be rendered to us by Art only so long as it is believed by us to be a revelation of a deeper truth in things.' Now this deeper truth is found in harmony with nature with-

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, v. 255.

<sup>2</sup> See G. H. Fowler, *Things Old and New*, 58.

<sup>3</sup> *Factors of Success*, by H. T. Whitford.

<sup>4</sup> Fourth Edition, 1900, p. 440.

<sup>5</sup> 'Memorial Verses.'

<sup>6</sup> Quoted by W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*,

out and with the moral law within. It is found in harmony with the will of God. And again, if moral success is harmony with God's will, it is evident that many are called to it, but few are chosen.

There is an American book among this month's issues entitled *Victorious Manhood* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). The author is Dr. Howard A. Johnston. It is moral manhood that is the subject. And if we would see how few they are that find it, we have but to read the titles of the chapters. He who reaches moral manhood has (1) the Spirit of Sonship, (2) the Spirit of Surrender, (3) the Spirit of Stewardship, (4) the Spirit of the Soldier, (5) the Spirit of the Servant, (6) the Spirit of the Soul-winner, (7) the Spirit of Strength through Hardships, and (8) the Spirit of the Saint.

But this is no more than our Lord meant when He told the young ruler to keep the commandments. Only the few can answer, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' And what is that? Who can sell all that he has and give to the poor? Who can be perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect?

### 3. What are the causes of failure?

1. One cause is that while many are called, only few are chosen. And what is that? It is simply that they themselves do not choose. The parable makes that unmistakable. Many were invited to the wedding feast, few accepted the invitation. They were busy otherwise, one with his farm, another with his merchandise. The parable passed into real life, and became deep enough tragedy, when Jesus stood over Jerusalem, and said, 'How often would I . . . but ye would not.'

But the word is very significant. It is not 'few choose'; it is 'few are chosen.' It is parallel to that other word, 'they which were bidden were not worthy.' Not worthy? They were the élite of the land. In comparison with those who came from the lanes and byways they were surely worthy to sit at a king's table. The king himself says they were not worthy. And their conduct proved it. For if they would not rise to a sense of the honour done them in receiving this invitation, they were not worthy to sit at the table. And, in like manner, they who do not choose to come are not chosen. It is no mystery of election. It is the will of man refusing to fall in with the will of God.

2. The only other cause of failure is that men choose in a wrong way. When the king came in

to see his guests he found a man who had not on a wedding-garment. He had come, but he had come in his own way. The rest of the guests were provided with a wedding-garment as they entered; he refused it. He was content with the garment he wore. And very likely it was better than the garment in which many of the other guests came to the door. The garment of the Pharisee who went up to the Temple to pray was very likely better than the garment of the Publican. And yet it was the Publican who went down to his house justified.

Can there, then, be any doubt as to the meaning of the wedding-garment? It is God's way of acceptance, not man's. It is 'the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.'

Dr. John Pulsford<sup>1</sup> warns us that we must have a righteousness of our own, and the warning is wise. But only our own in the sense that the wedding-garment, once gifted to the guest, is now his own. Certainly the righteousness of Christ is none the less righteousness that it is received, and none the less our righteousness. And certainly righteousness is just right living. But the acceptance, the place at the Feast, is not ours because we are righteous; it is ours because we have 'put on Christ.'

There is no clearer illustration than the life of Chalmers. When he was called to the parish of Kilmany, Chalmers simply did not know God. He chose the ministry as a profession, but he would have preferred a Chair of Mathematics if he could have got it. Then came his great illness. He was face to face with the seriousness of life. He was face to face with death. On his recovery, he began to keep a journal. It is a record of heroic efforts to make himself acceptable to God. It is heroic, but it is pitiful. For he has little success in it, and no satisfaction in the little success he has. He has come to the feast, but he is determined to wear his own wedding-garment. At the end of a year he read Wilberforce's *View of Christianity*. Ten years afterwards, in a letter to his youngest brother, he described the result.

MY DEAR ALEXANDER,—I stated to you that the effect of a very long confinement, about ten years ago, upon myself, was to inspire me with a set of very strenuous resolutions, under which I wrote a Journal, and made many a laborious effort to elevate my practice to the standard of

<sup>1</sup> *Loyalty to Christ*, ii. 355.

the Divine requirements. During this course, however, I got little satisfaction, and felt no repose. I remember that somewhere about the year 1811, I had Wilberforce's View put into my hands, and, as I got on in reading it, felt myself on the eve of a great revolution in all my opinions about Christianity. I am now most thoroughly of opinion, and it is an opinion founded on experience, that on the system of—Do this and live, no peace, and even no true and worthy obedience, can ever be attained. It is, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. When this belief enters the heart, joy and confidence enter along with it. The righteousness which we try to work out for ourselves bodes our impotent grasp, and never can a soul arrive at true or permanent rest in the pursuit of this object. The righteousness, which, by faith, we put on, secures our acceptance with God, and secures our interest in His promises, and gives us a part in those sanctifying influences by which we are enabled to do with aid from on high what we never can do without it. We look to God in a new light—we see Him as a reconciled Father; that love to Him which terror scares away re-enters the heart, and, with a new principle and a new power, we become new creatures in Jesus Christ our Lord.<sup>1</sup>

### A Study in the Life of Isaac.

It is the first sermon in a volume which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published, and of which professor Hugh Mackintosh, of the New College, Edinburgh, is the author. Its title is *Life on God's Plan* (5s.). That is also the title of the first sermon.

Life on God's plan—that, says Dr. Mackintosh, is the life of Isaac. For there are three elements in a life lived according to the will of God, and they are all in the life of Isaac, and all 'within the four corners' of Professor Mackintosh's text. Isaac builded an altar there, and called upon the name of the Lord, and pitched his tent there; and here Isaac's servants digged a well' (Gn 26<sup>25</sup>)—that is the text. And the three elements are the *altar*, the *tent*, and the *well*. That is to say, *Religion*, *home*, and *work*.

**I. Religion.**—'He builded an altar there and called upon the name of the Lord.' The erection of an altar is almost a standing formula in the story of the patriarchs. And the Pilgrim Fathers, when they stepped on the savage shores of the New World, provided first for the house of God. This is the first or basal element in a complete existence.

**2. The second element in our life, as God plans it, is a *Home*.** 'Isaac pitched his tent there,' A

tent? Emblem of the life of the 'sojourner as in a strange country'? Yes, a tent, that we may remember to cultivate a detached spirit in regard to things unseen. For, as Robert Barbour used to say, 'Like the Jacobites, our King too is over the water.' But although a tent, it was a home. Round that little shed of canvas clustered Isaac's dearest hopes. Thither Rebekah came. There his children were born. There he exercised the hospitality so dear to an Oriental heart, and sat in the evening light to dispense justice to his people. To him it was the focus of experience.

Dr. Mackintosh observes the simplicity of Isaac's home life. And then, more emphatically, the pervasion of Isaac's home-life by the spirit of religion.

**3. Work.**—'There Isaac's servants digged a well.' For work is not necessarily toil, but different, and these two will one day be separated once for all. 'His servants shall serve him,' when 'sorrow and sighing shall flee away.' Does not the well feed both tent and altar? As for the well and the altar, the one means work, and the other means sacrifice; and how can a man offer sacrifice who does no work? How can a man be made fit for the high fellowship of God, or indeed for the pure felicity of home, if he escapes the discipline, the long education, of worthy and honest toil?

### Two Studies in Old English.

#### A MERE MAN.

The first is the adjective *mere*. There is a substantive *mere* also, but it is a different word. The substantive—which means 'the sea,' and is of Teutonic derivation, though connected with Latin *mare*—is altogether obsolete, although it may still be used effectively in poetry or in poetic prose. There are two substantives indeed, the other meaning a boundary, also of Teutonic origin and connected with the Latin *murus*.

As there are two substantives, so, to be quite exact, are there two adjectives. There is an old adjective *mere* which means 'illustrious,' and of which no clear example has been found by Murray later than the fourteenth century.

The adjective we have to do with is of classical origin. It comes from the Latin *merus* which means 'undiluted' as applied to wine, or 'unmixed' as applied to peoples and languages.

Now this adjective 'mere' has passed through

<sup>1</sup> W. Hanna, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Palms*, i. 185.

one of the strangest experiences of any word in the English language. The best account of it is given by Craik in his book on *The English of Shakespeare*. Speaking of the adverb 'merely,' Craik says: 'It separates that which it designates or qualifies from everything else. But in so doing the chief or most emphatic reference may be made either to that which is included, or to that which is excluded. In modern English it is always to the latter; by "merely upon myself" we should now mean upon nothing else except myself; the *nothing else* is that which the *merely* makes prominent. In Shakespeare's day the other reference was the more common, that, namely, to what was included; and "merely upon myself" meant upon myself altogether, or without regard to anything else. *Myself* was that which the *merely* made prominent. So when Hamlet, speaking of the world, says (i. 2), "Things rank and gross in nature possess it *merely*," he by the *merely* brings the *possession* before the mind, and characterizes it as complete and absolute; but by the same term now the prominence would be given to something else from which the possession might be conceived to be separable; "possess it *merely*" would mean have nothing beyond simply the possession of it (have, it might be, no right to it, or no enjoyment of it).'

Craik gives a good example of the misunderstanding that sometimes arises through the change that has taken place in the meaning of *mere* and *merely*. His example is from Bacon's essay 'Of Vicissitudes of Things.' Bacon says: 'As for conflagrations and great droughts, they do not merely dispeople and destroy,' meaning that they do not *altogether* do so. But modern editors have changed the sentence, sometimes leaving out the 'not' and sometimes changing the 'and' into 'but.'

The word does not occur in the A.V., but it is an important word in the history of theology, where its misunderstanding has done something to discredit the doctrine of election. 'God, having of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life'—so the Shorter Catechism—and the liberal theologian holds up his hands in horror. But the word is as gracious as it is expressive. In the last sermon which Latimer preached before King Edward, a sermon on Covetousness (the date is 1550), we read that the sparrows 'are fed by God's mere providence and goodness.' In the Pastoral Letter which Knox left with his

brethren in Scotland when he accepted the call to the English congregation in Geneva (the date is 1556), we find a like sentiment: 'Let your tounis learne to prais the gracious gudness of him wha of his meir mercie hath callit you fra darknes to lyght and fra deth to lyfe.'

As illustrative (and perhaps the original) of the passage in the Shorter Catechism, take this from *The Judgement of the Synod at Dort*: 'Now Election is the vnchangeable purpose of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, according to the most free pleasure of his will, and of his meere grace, out of all mankinde, fallen through their owne fault, from their first integrity into sinne and destruction, hee hath chosen in Christ vnto saluation a set number of certaine men, neither better, nor more worthy then others.'

#### TAKE NO THOUGHT.

The other study may be short. It is the word *thought*. There is an article on it in the *Dictionary of the Bible* (iv. 754). It is referred to here because in an article in the *Hibbert Journal*, of which there is some account on another page, the writer, from want of the knowledge of the meaning of this word in the Authorized Version, charges our Lord with utterly condemning provident regard for the future. His words are these: 'Provident regard for the future is utterly condemned. "Take no thought for the morrow" is an absolute injunction. But all our Insurance Societies are avowedly founded on the opposite of this. Friendly, Co-operative, and Trade Union Societies are organized on the principle condemned in this sermon, and Christian governments prepare their national budgets at least twelve months in advance. The principle of some of these instructions may have its value as an ideal. But as regulative ideas for the government of personal conduct and associated life they have been useless, and they have been mischievous.'

On this characteristic paragraph it will be sufficient to quote the comment of Dr. James Drummond: 'Mr. Roberts declares, "Provident regard for the future is utterly condemned. *Take no thought for the morrow* is an absolute injunction"; and he seems greatly pleased that the world has shown itself superior to this foolish precept. A note to Pope's translation of the *Odyssey* says "When critics find fault, they ought to take care

that they impute nothing to an author, but what the author really speaks, otherwise it is not criticism, but calumny and ignorance." On the justice of this remark I must allow the readers to pronounce. I am sure Mr. Roberts would not willingly lapse into the fault which is here stigmatized; but I fear that in this case he has yielded to one of those deluding naps to which even the "good Homer" occasionally succumbed. As Macaulay would have observed, "every schoolboy knows" that there is no such precept as Mr. Roberts quotes in the Sermon on the Mount, and that its

appearance in the Authorized Version is due to a phrase which, in its modern meaning, has become a glaring mistranslation, and accordingly has been altered by the revisers. It is not necessary to remind readers of the HIBBERT JOURNAL that the precept is directed against the distrustful "anxiety" which makes the "word" unfruitful. It will be a happier as well as a better world when men are filled with the quiet content of an assured trust, and, having fulfilled their duties, leave their outward lot without doubt or fear to the disposal of Providence.'

## The Logia of the Baptist.

BY THE REV. J. C. TODD, M.A., B.Sc., OAKFIELD SCHOOL, CROUCH END, LONDON.

ST. JOHN the Baptist is one of the most striking figures in Jewish history, but both sources of our knowledge of 'him' (Josephus and the Gospels) have been regarded with suspicion. The passage in Josephus (*Ant. xviii. v. 2*) has been denounced as an interpolation, and the accounts of the Evangelists are supposed to be coloured by the prejudices of the Apostolic Church.

It is therefore highly important to show (if we can) that we are in possession of a document which is free from taint and proceeds from the disciples of St. John himself.

In the first section of St. Mark's Gospel (1<sup>2-8</sup>) we have obviously the regular Christian account of the Baptist in so terse a form that it seems to carry us back to the pre-literary stage and to be designed for oral repetition. We have, first, the two great texts from the Bible (*i.e.* the Old Testament); the former used on the authority of our Lord (Lk 7<sup>27</sup>), and the latter on that of the Baptist himself (Jn 1<sup>23</sup>). Then follows a brief account of St. John's Baptism; and lastly, his great 'witness' of the 'One stronger than I,' and the prophecy of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The account of the Baptist's food and clothing (v. 6) is probably due to the Evangelist himself, being one of the graphic details in which he delights.

When we turn to the third chapter of St. Luke we find something totally different, and it is the object of this paper to show that in the first

twenty verses we have a source-document of the Baptist's teaching, and that it owes nothing to Christian editing except the abridgment at its conclusion.

1. The elaborate list of reigning authorities (the Emperor, the Procurator, three Tetrarchs, and two High Priests) is given definitely as the date when 'the word of God came to John.' This is not a sufficiently specific *Christian* date to justify the use of some forty words in expressing it. The suggestion of von Soden (*Enc. Bib. 'Chronology,'*) that it is really meant to help us to the date of the Crucifixion, can hardly be correct, since it is almost impossible to say how long a period the Evangelist assigns to the ministries of the Baptist and our Lord. A Christian compiler might incorporate such a statement but hardly compose it for himself.

2. The sonorous roll of these names reads like the beginning of a treatise, and we find the phrase 'the word of the Lord (or God) to . . .' in the opening verse of seven of the fifteen prophetic books of the Old Testament. The Greek is usually λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς, but in Jer 1<sup>1</sup> we have ρῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ as here. Otherwise the sentence more nearly resembles Zec 1<sup>1</sup>.

3. The section (v. 10-14) which relates the questions of the people and the answers of the Baptist has no Messianic or Christian significance, and is on that account omitted in the parallel text of St. Matthew.

4. In v.<sup>16</sup> we have the announcement of the coming baptism, *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πνοῇ*. This became famous in the early Church as a prophecy of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the difficulty of the 'fire' was met in two ways. On the one hand St. Mark simply omits it, and on the other we have the writer of the Acts (2<sup>8</sup>) telling us that *γλῶσσαι ὥστε πνοής* appeared at Pentecost, while Justin Martyr relates that at the Lord's Baptism a fire was kindled in the Jordan (*Dial. c. Try.* 88). This latter belief was common (Otto's *Justin, ad loc.*).

In view of the great importance of this text it is startling to find a reading (in St. Luke only) which omits 'holy,' and by so doing (as we shall see) turns 'spirit' into 'wind.' No doubt it is poorly attested (Hort, Appendix to Introd. p. 57), but the fact that it has survived at all leads us to accept it without hesitation and makes us realize that we are in the presence of a definitely pre-Christian text.

That by *πνεῦμα* the Baptist understood 'wind' and not 'spirit' is evident from the following verse. He pictures the Minister of Judgment standing on the threshing-floor with the shovel in his hands, throwing the wheat into the air, that the chaff may be blown away by the *wind*, and when it has heaped itself up, be destroyed by *fire*. (An indistinct recollection of this meaning of *πνεῦμα* is probably preserved in the *πνοή* of Ac 2<sup>2</sup> side by side with the *πνεῦμα* of v. 4).

It is possible, of course, that the idea of 'wind and fire' is primary and the figure of the threshing-floor simply a happy illustration, for it is plausible to derive the doctrine of the two baptisms from Is 4<sup>4</sup>, *ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος τὸν ῥύπον τῶν νιῶν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων Σιών, καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐκκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐν πνεύματι κρίσεως καὶ πνεύματι καίσεως*; but whether the 'threshing-floor' be text or commentary it determines the meaning of *πνεῦμα*.

5. After the great Messianic prophecy (vv. 16. 17) we have a fairly well-turned Greek sentence (vv. 18-20) carrying us on to St. John's imprisonment. John preached 'many other things' and reproved Herod for Herodias and 'all his wicked deeds,' and was accordingly shut up in prison. The most obvious explanation of this sentence is that the Evangelist has already got his most important quotation and now quickly but carefully sums up the rest of the book before him.

6. Assuming that vv. 1-17 are a quotation, and

vv. 18-20 a summary, it is evident that this source was not a Christian work. It contained no account of the Baptism of the Lord. St. Luke has to turn back from John's imprisonment to relate this event. If he had found it in his previous source he would surely have inserted it between vv. 18. 19.

7. A few minor points may be added, of no great weight individually, but tending to increase the cumulative force. (a) John is called 'the son of Zacharias' here only in the Gospel, but there may be a reference to chap. i in this designation. (b) The quotation from Isaiah is carried on beyond the ordinary Christian stopping-place (Matt. and Mk.). (c) John addresses the crowds as 'broods of vipers.' This is not in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel, and in Matthew the 'crowds' are altered to the 'Pharisees and Sadducees.'

From all this we may conclude that we have here an original document from the school of the Baptist, and this is of importance not only for itself but for the criticism of Q (the Logia of Jesus). As restored by Harnack, Q begins with the words of the Baptist, a section which is quite in place in a Gospel but hardly in a collection of Sayings of the Lord. This comes into Q simply by the mechanical process of selecting the non-Marcan material common to St. Matthew and St. Luke. If the arguments given above are sound, we restore this section to its context in St. Luke's Gospel and show that the 'Logia of John' probably antedated and possibly suggested the 'Logia of Jesus.'

When was the book of the Logia of the Baptist compiled? If, as St. Luke suggests, it ended with St. John's imprisonment, we have the fascinating suggestion that it was compiled before his death. I do not, however, think that this was the case. Whoever first wrote Lk 3<sup>1.2</sup>, it remains a curious passage because the date is given *precisely* in the first clause, and only vaguely in the others. Pilate and the tetrarchs add nothing to chronological accuracy, and were probably inserted *for some other reason*. Does Josephus throw any light on this? He tells us (*loc. cit. supra*) that some people regarded the defeat of Antipas by Aretas as a judgment for the execution of the Baptist. Now the curious fact is that (with one exception) all the men mentioned in these verses were overtaken by misfortune a few years after the death of the Baptist (especially if we assume that the date

29 A.D. given here is correct for his 'call'). Tiberius and Herod Philip died. Pilate was recalled, Antipas was banished, Caiaphas was deposed. Whoever Lysanias of Abilene may have been, he lost his tetrarchy. I believe that the writer meant us to see (and probably pointed out in his book) how widespread and terrible was God's judgment.

*Major est vis instantiae negativa* and no known disaster happened to the high priest Annas.

But the correct reading is ἐπ' ἀρχιερέως, which suggests that either Annas or Caiaphas is a later interpolation (perhaps by the Evangelist when he copied the passage). Now we know from Josephus that Caiaphas was high priest at this time, and we also know that the writer of the Acts (perhaps our Evangelist) had a theory that Annas was still high priest in spite of his deposition (Ac 4<sup>o</sup>). It is therefore probable that the Logia of the Baptist had simply ἐπ' ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα in this place.

## Literature.

### WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

In the history of literature, as well as in the history of the Church, the end of the year 1909 will be remembered because in it was published the first volume of the Standard Edition of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (Culley; 21s. net). The Standard Edition of Wesley's Journal will consist of six volumes. To those who purchase the whole work, the price, as we see from the advertisements, will be only three guineas, and there is an offer made to subscribers that one guinea may be paid on subscription, and half a guinea on the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4, and 5; whereupon the last volume will be sent free.

The editor is the Rev. Nehemiah Curnock, who has not only been preparing materials for this final edition throughout many years, but has also himself, for a much greater length of time, been prepared for it. He has had a sense of his high calling, and he has been aware that he is surrounded with a great cloud of witnesses. Many of these witnesses have gone before. Mr. Curnock does not doubt that he is doing his work under the eye of Wesley himself. Many of them are yet unborn. For this edition is not named 'Standard' without sufficient foresight. So thorough has been the search for materials, in the New World as in the Old, that there is not the least prospect of anything important lying yet concealed. And so wisely have the materials been used that the estimate here reached of John Wesley's character and John Wesley's career may safely be stated to be final. It is a great opportunity for the Church of Christ. Without respect of creed or combination, let the

student of the history of Religion seize the opportunity of reading this Journal throughout, page by page.

The new material is extensive and vital. It does not involve a reversal of our judgment on John Wesley, but it involves considerable modification of it. And it is such modification as Wesley's greatest admirer need not shrink from making; for it is all in the direction of nobility. It shows John Wesley to have had a greater mind than we knew he had, a larger heart than we knew; it shows that he had found the brook Jabbok and the wrestling angel earlier in his life and more awfully than we were aware of, and that he had become, more grandly than we knew, a prince with God. What a story that 'Sixth Savannah Journal' contains. Fact or fiction?—no romance writer ever awoke human emotion at a deeper depth than this.

### THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

FOUR volumes have now been issued of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature' (Camb. Univ. Press; 9s. net each). It is time we understood its object and its accomplishment.

The editors, Dr. A. W. Ward and Mr. A. R. Waller, both of Peterhouse, have told us that their interest is not so much in the men of genius, as in the men of aspiration, the men who wrote for immortality and almost missed it. Why should they be interested in them? It is the Christian spirit entering at last into Literature. Carlyle and his hero-worship is out of date. We reverence now

the man and the woman who struck out for the heroic but did not altogether achieve it. And we do well.

But that is only part of the reason. This History of English Literature is to be a record of the work done not only by the men who reached the top, but also by the men who did not reach it, because their work made the work of the few greatest possible. English Literature is a growth, an evolution ; it is not an acrobatic series of leaps from Chaucer to Spenser, to Shakespeare, to Gibbon, to Browning, to Meredith. The editors will not neglect the peaks (to change the figure again), but they will explore the whole country as they pass through.

Now this aim is new, and it is well fulfilled. No History of English Literature was ever written that gave so much comparative attention to the English writers who have just escaped oblivion. And by making this an end, and keeping their eyes so firmly fixed upon it, the editors have done us a very great service. Is there the risk of dulness ? Well, even that risk was worth running in so good a cause. And the book is not dull. The chapters are reasonably short ; they are written untechnically and yet by men of expert knowledge. Within his space a writer has scarce time to begin to be dull. If he does begin, he is at once displaced by another. It is like a game of cricket. But the bowlers here are taken off before they lose their sting.

The first volume is *From the Beginnings to the Cycles of Romance*. Of all the cycles of Romance the most entertaining is the Arthurian. The chapter on the Arthurian Legend is written by Professor Lewis Jones of Bangor. It is cleverly written and easy to read. But it should have been longer. Professor Jones has passed lightly over the great ancient controversies. Within his space it was wise to let sleeping dogs lie. But there is more stir when they are awake. In the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* there is an article on 'Arthur and the Arthurian Cycle,' by Professor Anwyl. That article makes deep respond to deep more fervently.

In the second volume (it goes to the end of the Middle Ages) the chapter that has found us most easily is the chapter on the Ballads. Its author is Professor Francis Gummere of Haverford College, in the States. Professor Gummere published a little volume on *The Popular Ballad* in 1907, which was reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. That volume made his choice unmistakable.

What is a ballad? A ballad, says Professor Gummere, is a narrative poem without any known author or any marks of individual authorship, meant for singing, and connected, as its name implies, with the communal dance. Through tradition it has lost its dramatic and choral character and become distinctly epic. It has in many instances even forfeited its refrain, once indispensable.

It is not the idea of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature' to give quotations at any length ; but here Professor Gummere quotes the ballad which begins—

There were three ladies lived in a bower,  
*Eh vow bonnie,*  
And they went out to pull a flower  
*On the bonnie banks o' Fordie.*

and when we read the ballad aloud, putting in the refrain at every verse, as he bids us, we feel the force of the refrain ; we see how insipid the ballad would be without it.

The third volume is called *Renaissance and Reformation*. In the second chapter there is a short account of the Bible translations that preceded the Authorized Version. It has not the fulness required for the student of the Bible, but it is enough for the student of English Literature.

We have examined the bibliography to this chapter—for the bibliographies are a great feature of the book and occupy much space in every volume. It is a good sound bibliography. *Old Bibles*, by J. R. Dore (not Doré), is a foolish book, not worth naming. Professor Ira M. Price's *Ancestry of our English Bible* should take its place. Lupton's article in the *Dictionary of the Bible* (which should not be called 'Biblical Dictionary') is mentioned, as well as the article on the Continental Versions by Bebb. But Kenyon's really great article on the English Versions in Hastings' Single-Volume Dictionary should now be added. There is one slip : J. L. Mombert should be J. I. Mombert.

While we are on the Bibliographies let us just add that among the works of general reference on Shakespeare might have been included the two great Concordances, Mrs. Cowden Clarke's and Mr. Bartlett's—especially Mr. Bartlett's.

The fourth volume carries the Prose and Poetry from Sir Thomas North to Michael Drayton. One of the earliest chapters is on the 'Authorized Version and its Influence.' The author is Pro-

fessor Albert S. Cook of Yale, who was chosen for this chapter, we imagine, because of the excellent pioneer work he did in his two volumes of *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers*, published in 1898 and 1903. The chapter is not so good as it is filled with good things. Perhaps Professor Cook found the ground too great for the limits of a single chapter. The topics touched are too numerous to be brought into proper relation to one another. All the same, the chapter is well worth reading. The student of the religious contents of the Bible is apt to overlook its literary value. By the reading of this chapter he will recognize that religion and literature go well together—the more religion the better literature.

The chapter on Donne is a masterpiece. It has been written by Professor Herbert J. C. Grierson, of the University of Aberdeen. There is no writer in all the book who has more clearly apprehended the editors' ideas or more loyally realized them; and, in apprehending and realizing them, Professor Grierson has vindicated the wisdom of these ideas. To the ordinary reader John Donne is little more than a name. After the reading of this chapter he will become a possession, just as Spenser or Dryden is a possession. More than that, the chapter is itself literature. Take a single quotation, with its appropriate illustration.

'Donne is most eloquent,' says Professor Grierson, 'when, escaping from dogmatic minutiae and controversial "points," he appeals directly to the heart and conscience. A reader may care little for the details of seventeenth century theology, and yet enjoy without qualification Donne's fervid and original thinking, and the figurative richness, and splendid harmonies of his prose in passages of argument, of exhortation, and of exalted meditation. It is Donne the poet who transcends every disadvantage of theme and method, and an outworn fashion in wit and learning. There are sentences in the sermons which, in beauty of imagery and cadence, are not surpassed by anything he wrote in verse, or by any prose of the century from Hooker's to Sir Thomas Browne's.'

Professor Grierson thereupon quotes the following single sentence by way of illustration: 'The soul that is accustomed to direct herself to God upon every occasion; that, as a flower at sunrise, conceives a sense of God in every beam of his, and spreads and dilates itself towards him

in a thankfulness in every small blessing that he sheds upon her; that soul that as a flower at the sun's declining contracts, and gathers in, and shuts up herself, as though she had received a blow, whensoever she hears her Saviour wounded by an oath, or blasphemy, or execration; that soul who, whatsoever string be strucken in her, base or treble, her high or her low estate, is ever tun'd towards God, that soul prays sometimes when it does not know that it prays.'

#### COLENSO AND GREEN.

Was there ever a book that so utterly missed its mark as the *Life of James Green?* (Longmans; 2 vols., 18s. net). James Green is described as 'Doctor of Divinity, Rector and Dean of Maritzburg, Natal, from February 1849 to January 1906.' His life has been written by the Rev. A. Theodore Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L. Now Dr. Wirgman is an acknowledged master in the making of books, and he has already made many of them. He undertook the writing of this book for the purpose of exhibiting to the world the greatness and the goodness of Dean James Green. And in order to accomplish that, he had to show that Bishop Colenso was neither good nor great. What he has actually done is to reveal to the world a forbearance and magnanimity in Colenso which the average Englishman can have had no idea of. How could a writer of Dr. Wirgman's experience have made such a mistake? We can account for it only by supposing that his intention was overwhelmed by the facts.

Colenso was appointed to the Bishopric of Natal by Bishop Gray of Cape Town, Metropolitan of South Africa. Arriving in his diocese, he found Mr. Green Rector of Maritzburg, and Rural Dean of Natal. As Bishop's Commissary, Mr. Green 'had exercised full powers of rule over the clergy for some four years. All those powers,' says his biographer, 'were laid down in a most tactful manner, for Bishop Colenso, though from the first he felt a dislike to Mr. Green, never hints a complaint against him on this score.' After ten weeks in Natal, Colenso paid a visit to London. From there he wrote a letter to Mr. Green, commending his zeal, but ending with this significant sentence: 'Would it not be better for you, and happier for both of us, that I should have in the chief pastor of Maritzburg a warm and

attached friend and zealous co-operator in my plans, as well as an adviser and comforter, who would share with me and help to lighten my burdens, instead of increasing them?' Mr. Green at once wrote to the Metropolitan, from whose reply the biographer makes this quotation: 'It appears to me that his (Bishop Colenso's) visit to Natal so far affected him as to lead him to wish to have another, rather than you, as his representative and chief adviser at Maritzburg. My own opinion is that neither of you fully appreciate each other. I think you have quite failed to see the beauty of his character, and the real nobleness of his disposition. He is a most devoted servant of God, and full of love for all that is good, and all good men. If I were to speak of any fault in him, it would be that his naturally sanguine and eager temperament leads him to *do* things somewhat impetuously. He acts, when a cooler and more cautious man would be thinking whether he ought to act.'

Mr. Green did not move. What he did was to set himself more than before in opposition to his bishop, and to use every means of thwarting him in all his undertakings. And as a diplomat Colenso was no match for him.

It is wonderful that, after three years, notwithstanding what Dr. Wrigman calls the uneasy relations between Bishop Colenso and the Rector of Maritzburg, Colenso wrote to Green and offered him the Deanery of the Cathedral. The biographer is surprised into a moment's admiration for the Bishop. 'This kindly and affectionate letter,' he says, 'showed that Bishop Colenso had learnt to value and esteem the Dean's personal worth and character. The Bishop was by nature a warm-hearted and kindly-tempered man.' But the offer and acceptance of the Deanery made no difference in Mr. Green's opposition. He adopted an attitude to the sacraments that was at the furthest remove from that of Bishop Colenso, an attitude which the Bishop of Oxford described as heresy.

If Colenso was impulsive, Green was watchful and determined. Then with the publication of Colenso's books on the Pentateuch he had his opportunity. He presented Colenso for heresy, and had the satisfaction of publicly reading his sentence of excommunication. It is an old controversy now, and no one need have any feeling about it on the one side or the other. Let us thank Dr. Wrigman that he has given us the

opportunity of appreciating Bishop Colenso of Natal, although that was evidently far from his intention in writing the book. For we see that Colenso's faults were all on the side of generosity and outspokenness. As for his 'heresy,' he was simply in advance of his day. The nine charges against him, every one of which was found relevant, and upon which he was deposed, contain statements which are found in the works of the most orthodox men of to-day, and they do not contain a single statement upon which a charge of heresy would now be laid against any man. Think of a man being condemned, for example, for saying, 'I cannot any longer maintain or give utterance to the endlessness of future punishments.' Colenso died suddenly on the 20th of June 1883. Dr. James Green lived till the 10th of January 1906.

#### Dante.

Are Messrs. George Bell & Sons' 'Handbooks to the Poets' as well known as they ought to be? We have an impression that they are not. Mrs. Orr's *Handbook to Browning* is found in a good many libraries, but one rarely sees reference made to Morton Luce's *Handbook to Shakespeare* or the same author's *Handbook to Tennyson*. Perhaps Tennyson does not require a handbook, and Shakespeare has too many already.

The new volume in the series is a *Handbook to the Works of Dante* (6s.). The author is Mr. F. J. Snell, M.A., who tells us that he has studied Dante, as well as the literature on Dante. It is not to be supposed that the publishers would put such a book into the hands of an incompetent. Mr. Snell is quite competent. But so are other ten men whom we could name. What is most distinctive is not the ability of the author, but the construction of the book. Although it is described in the preface as an introduction to Dante's works in general and the *Commedia* in particular, the *Commedia* is not reached until the 269th page. That, we say, is what makes the book distinctive, and that is what makes it useful. For the previous 268 pages are occupied with the things about Dante and Dante's writings which not everybody knows, the things which everybody ought to know. In short, this is really an introduction to Dante, not anticipating the things which we must discover for ourselves in the study of Dante, but to be mastered before we begin that study.

### The Idea of the Soul.

The title which Mr. A. E. Crawley has given to his new book, *The Idea of the Soul* (A. & C. Black ; 6s. net), looks as if he were taking us by guile, and engaging us in the study of psychology, that most difficult of all the sciences, without our knowing it. And he does engage us in the study of psychology, whether we know it or not. For the first five chapters of the book, which is two-thirds of it, are psychological. Yet Mr. Crawley's interest is not in psychology as a science. His interest is in the belief and practice of psychology over the face of the whole earth. For he is a student of Comparative Religion. His previous books, which have given him no small name in that department, are *The Mystic Rose: A Study of Primitive Marriage*; and, *The Tree of Life: A Study of Religion*. With the issue of the present volume Mr. Crawley will certainly become one of the best known, as he is one of the most accomplished, of the students of that new and fascinating science. It is quite easy to hazard the prophecy that after a little this book will be found practically indispensable both to the student of psychology, for whom it furnishes innumerable practical examples, not the less useful that they are often abnormal, and to the student of Comparative Religion, whom it will introduce to the most perplexing topic with which he has to do.

### Hawkins's 'Horæ Synopticae.'

What are the absolutely indispensable books for the study of the Synoptic problem? They are Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* and Sir John Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticae*. Of Sir John Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticae* the second edition, revised and supplemented, has just been published (Clarendon Press ; 10s. 6d. net).

It is not altered in essentials, but the whole book has been worked over minutely with the hope, as the author puts it, of supplying some of the 'deficiencies,' and removing some of the 'imperfections,' of the first edition. Also numerous small supplements have been made to many of the lists, and especially to those concerned with the characteristics of the three Synoptists, in order to render them as nearly complete as possible.

One other thing must be mentioned: it will be found more and more characteristic of the best English scholarship. The section which gives an

account of the chief source used in the First and Third Gospels outside St. Mark has been very largely rewritten, not because of much change of opinion on the author's part, but *in order to avoid the appearance of a claim to more certainty than has yet been reached on this subject*.

### Milton and Liberty.

'Of no phase of liberty did Milton write with such a glow as of that which makes it the correlative of virtue. This idea is one of the great recurrences alike in his poems and his prose works. It is the regnant idea of *Paradise Lost*. Through man's original lapse, true liberty was lost,

which always with right reason dwells  
Twinned, and from her hath no dvidual being.

It is the theme of *Comus*, in whose closing words he gives it a magnificence of expression that lodges it imperishably in the ear:

Mortals, that would follow me,  
Love Virtue: she alone is free.  
She can teach ye how to climb  
Higher than the sphery chime;  
Or if Virtue feeble were,  
Heaven itself would stoop to her.'

This quotation is taken from a little book, a book of remarkable and timely interest, entitled *Milton and Liberty*, written by the Rev. William Morison, D.D., of Rosehall Church, Edinburgh, (Green & Sons). It is a study of Milton for the student of literature. Much more than that, it is a study of Liberty for the citizen of to-day and to-morrow.

### Myths of the Middle Ages.

*Myths and Legends of the Middle Ages: Their Origin and Influence on Literature and Art*, by H. A. Guerber (Harrap ; 7s. 6d. net). This is not a contribution to the science of Mythology. There is no learned research into the 'Childhood of Fiction,' or any scholastic account of a fable's far travel. Mr. Guerber is a popularizer. He re-tells the myths of the Middle Ages, as he has already re-told the myths of Greece and Rome and the myths of the Norsemen, for easy reading at the fireside; and his publishers make his books yet more popular by inserting into them a large number of full-page illustrations from celebrated works of art.

### The Unspeakable Scot ?

There is no preface to this posthumous book by Dr. John Watson, which is called *The Scot of the Eighteenth Century* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s.). That is wise. For a preface might have been an apology. It is reading that is pleasantly unpleasant. Racy and anecdotal, it is altogether pleasant if you are a Moderate or do not care. But if you are an Evangelical? Well, even among the Evangelicals there is one wholly attractive figure, and we shall quote the description of him. It is Fraser of Alness.

'He is the only one of those Highland eighteenth century worthies who has achieved fame as an author, and he was a man of profound and intelligent piety. His power in searching the heart and awakening the conscience was so great, and his calling was so distinctly that of John the Baptist, that many people awakened under his preaching, and looking for comfort, used to go to a neighbouring parish to hear the Gospel. Mr. Porteous, its minister, spoke to Fraser about the matter, and besought him "not to withhold their portion from the people of the Lord, which you can dispense to them as I never could." Fraser's reply deserves to be placed on record, as an instance of humility and brotherly love. "When my Master sent me forth to my work, He gave me a quiver full of arrows, and He ordered me to cast these arrows at the hearts of His enemies, till the quiver was empty. I have been endeavouring to do so, but the quiver is not empty yet. When the Lord sent you forth, He gave you a cruse of oil, and His orders to you were to pour the oil on the wounds of broken-hearted sinners till the cruse was empty. Your cruse is no more empty than is my quiver; let us both then continue to act on our respective order. As the blessing from on high shall rest on our labour, I will be sending my hearers with wounded hearts to Kilmuir, and you will be sending them back to Alness rejoicing in the Lord." Overcome by this beautiful reply, Porteous said, "Be it so, my beloved brother"!'

### Marcus Dods.

Professor H. R. Mackintosh did a deed of true filial piety when he gathered together and edited this volume of sermons by the late Principal Dods. The title is *Christ and Man* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s.). At the end of the volume there is published the address on 'The Work of the Ministry' which Dr. Dods delivered at the close of the session,

March 28th, 1907. From which take this characteristic quotation :

'Lessing, in a plaintive letter to his brother, says, "Of all pitiful creatures I believe the most pitiful is he who must work with his head, when he is not conscious of having one." But there is a more pitiful creature: and that is he who must work with his soul, when he is not conscious of having a soul. It is this that is pictured by Thackeray in one of the most terrible passages in English literature. He shows us the magnificent genius of Swift, torn by his own scepticism, poisoned by the cassock he had assumed, strangled in his bands, dying at last, as Swift himself says, like a rat in a hole. "What a night it was," says Thackeray, "what a lonely rage and long agony, what a vulture that tore the heart of that giant! . . . One hardly anywhere reads of such a pain." That is true. All imagined tragedies fall short of the actual. One hardly anywhere *reads* of such a pain; but in lesser men than Swift a life of torture results from entering the ministry with selfish motives or unconquered sin. There is no happier life than that of a minister who is truly Christ's servant delighting in the service; none much more miserable than that of him who cannot "lose his life" for Christ's sake, but is still seeking recognition, applause, comfort for himself; who knows the purity demanded of those who represent the Holiest, but who still carries with him into the most sacred services a sin against which he has not the heart to take final measures of extinction.'

### The Book of Friendship.

*The Book of Friendship* (Jack ; 6s. net) is a collection of essays, poems, maxims and prose passages from authors ancient and modern, selected and arranged by Mr. Arthur Ransome. Many are ancient enough to be out of copyright, and we may find them for ourselves. But here they are brought together so that the one illustrates the other and each gets benefit from the illustration. And they are printed in a beautiful type on pure white paper with broad luxuriant margins. Some of them are copyright. Mr. Ransome has had to get liberty to reproduce them; and one of them at least has never been published before. We shall quote one of the shortest, a poem by Mr. W. B. Yeats, in which 'the poet pleads with his friend for old friends.'

Though you are in your shining days,  
 Voices among the crowd  
 And new friends busy with your praise,  
 Be not unkind or proud,  
 But think about old friends the most:  
 Time's bitter flood will rise,  
 Your beauty perish and be lost  
 For all eyes but these eyes.

#### Theism and the Christian Faith.

Are there any marks by which we may distinguish Christianity from other religions—marks that are unmistakable and unmistakably superior? Perhaps, however, we should first ask what it is that marks superiority in a religion. And that is another way of asking, what is a religion for? The best religion is that which fulfils the end of religion best.

Dr. Everett says that the aim of religion is to heal the breach that exists between man and his environment. Environment is a good word. It includes God. It includes our own particular definition of God. Now there is such a breach, and many attempts have been made to heal it. The attempt has been made through sacrifice, and in a negative sense through retribution. When Christianity came it was differentiated from all the religions that preceded it by these four marks. In the first place, it was a religion without the rites of sacrifice. Secondly, whereas in the classic religions, especially the elements of fate were present, in this religion we find instead a recognition of providence. Thirdly, suffering, hitherto looked upon as one of the chief elements in the breach, is now accepted and glorified. Finally, death, which has been feared as the great enemy of man, is welcomed with joy.

After the death of Professor Everett, the Faculty of Harvard undertook the publication of his Divinity Lectures. There were three courses. The first course was published in 1902, under the title of *The Psychological Elements of Religious Faith*. The second is perhaps not to be published. The third course has now been published, under the title of *Theism and the Christian Faith* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). In the first course Dr. Everett dealt with the psychological roots of religion which he found in the feelings appropriate to the three ideas of truth, goodness, and beauty. In the third course he unfolds the philosophical implications of these three ideas in a doctrine of

God as Absolute Spirit, and of Christianity as the absolute religion.

The first question therefore is, What is God? 'A definition of God that has been commonly given,' says Dr. Everett, 'describes Him as a Perfect Being with infinite attributes. My own definition would be precisely the opposite of this. I should describe God as an Infinite Being with perfect attributes.'

The next question is, What is religion? We have already seen what Christianity is. Towards his definition of religion Professor Everett works up slowly. He arrives at this at last: 'Religion is the Feeling toward a Supernatural Presence manifesting itself in Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, especially as illustrated in the life and teaching of Jesus and as experienced in every soul that is open to its influence.'

Professor Everett must have been a delightful lecturer. For he was an original thinker, as well as a lucid emotional writer. It is a wonderful thing that this magnificent volume could have been produced from his students' notebooks. There was nothing else to go upon. We should have missed one of the pleasures of our life if we had not had the opportunity of reading it.

#### Hort's 'Epistle of St. James.'

In the year 1860, Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort planned a Commentary on the New Testament. To Hort was assigned the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter and St. Jude. After a brief period of work on the Gospels, of which only a few unimportant fragments remain, Dr. Hort set to work on St. James. He wrote a commentary on the text as far as the seventh verse of the fourth chapter, but he never finished it. That commentary is now published, together with an introduction which was prepared for a course of lectures in 1889, the whole being edited by Dr. J. O. F. Murray (Macmillan; 5s.).

In the Introduction Hort comes to the conclusion that the Epistle was written by 'James the Just, bishop or head of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord as being son of Joseph by a former wife, not one of the Twelve, a disbeliever in our Lord's Messiahship during His lifetime, but a believer in Him shortly afterwards, probably in connexion with a special appearance vouchsafed to him.'

The commentary, so far as it goes, is very full, and no doubt very rich, though we have not yet had time to test it thoroughly. In 1<sup>17</sup> Hort insists upon expressing the difference between the two Greek words, but uses 'giving' and 'gift,' instead of the 'gift' and 'boon' of the R.V. The true interpretation he finds in Erskine's *Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel*. He approves of Erskine's paraphrase: 'There are no bad gifts, no bad events; every appointment is gracious in its design and divinely fitted for that design.' His own rendering is 'every giving is good and every gift perfect from above, descending (as they do) from the Father of lights.'

#### Forms.

In the *Directory and Forms for Public Worship*, issued by the Church Worship Association of the United Free Church of Scotland (Macniven & Wallace; 2s. 6d. net), two ideals are combined. 'Presbyterian Forms of Service' presented the one ideal, 'A New Directory for the Public Worship of God' the other. The one ideal is to offer exemplary services, the other is to offer material and suggestion for services. Perhaps the combination is best. But of the two separate ideals we have always thought the United Presbyterian one was the better.

#### The Survival of Man.

There is psychology and there is psychical research. The one is a science, depending on facts and proceeding by the usual methods of induction and deduction. The other is make-believe; it depends on the lack of both facts and faith; it is an occasional diversion to a few unoccupied men and a large number of unoccupied women.

The whole story of Psychical Research, what it is and what it has failed to do, will be found in Sir Oliver Lodge's new book, of which the title is *The Survival of Man: A Study in Unrecognized Human Faculty* (Methuen; 7s. 6d. net). There is nothing in it. There are plenty of words, plenty of long words that hold their heads high and make pathetic pretence of being something, words like 'thought - transference,' 'clairvoyance,' 'habitability,' 'cross-correspondence.' But they are only words, as many-syllabled as the name Melchizedek, and as independent as he is said to have been of all human relationship.

Now it is not to be said that we have any ill-will

to Psychical Research. Who would have? Do we not humour it with capitals, the savoury meat that it loves? But we must express surprise that men and women can persist in the pretence that there is anything in it, or that there is ever in the least likely to be anything. Moreover, the atmosphere of it is certainly not invigorating.

Turn to the chapter in Sir Oliver Lodge's book on Prevision. There is hope in turning to it. Have we not all a lurking belief in second-sight? And has it not some far-away kinship to such a very respectable subject as Hebrew prophecy?

What do we find? A case is quoted of an engine-driver in America who had a dream in which he saw his engine go over an embankment. He told the dream to a lady ('now dead'); and it came to pass that his engine went over an embankment. Was he not interviewed in America by an agent of the S.P.R.? And then there is a complicated and puerile case of automatic writing by Mrs. Verrall of Cambridge, with insignificant names and unrelated incidents, half of which turned out wrong. All this is told at interminably solemn length. And that is all.

And what is hoped for? Proof of the continued existence of the departed? Job knew that, two thousand years ago, unless we have mistranslated him. And what good did it do him? Of itself it did him no good. But 'I know that my Redeemer liveth'—he found good in that.

#### 'The Spiritual Combat.'

When the Bishop of Belley asked St. Francis de Sales who had been his director, he pulled out of his pocket *The Spiritual Combat*, and said, 'Le voilà!' So *The Spiritual Combat* is a very proper addition to make to Methuen's 'Library of Devotion.' The editor is the Rev. Thomas Barns, M.A., Vicar of Hilderstone, a great student of lore and folk-lore, who has made the translation from the Italian himself, using for that purpose the Turin edition of 1904. He has also written notes and an introduction, all showing minute, loving knowledge of this devotional classic, and a mind made up on the authorship (Methuen; 2s.).

#### Bishop Howard Wilkinson.

Messrs. Mowbray have published another volume of sermons by the late Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews, under the title of *The Heavenly Vision* (5s. net). If this means that the first volume did

well, it is an encouragement to preachers to publish their sermons, provided their sermons are free from all tricks of oratory and efforts after effect. Bishop Wilkinson's sermons have Christ as their subject, and sincerity as their motive; and that is all. They have scarcely ever even an anecdote.

It was Dr. Wilkinson's lot to have to preach for some years to the very wealthy. There is no class on earth so difficult to preach to, so strong is the temptation either to preach at them or not to preach at all. It is in one of these sermons that this anecdote occurs. Wilkinson is showing how hard it is for those who have riches to enter the Kingdom, and he says: 'Some fifteen years ago, one who has long since departed out of this life, but who then occupied the leading position (I might say) in London, second, I think, only to Royalty, said to me this: "Do you not see, Mr. Wilkinson, how almost impossible it is for me really to wish to go out of this world, for I have everything to make me love this world?" Now contrast that with another man, who spoke to me some ten years ago. It was late in the evening, in my old parish of Windmill Street, and I had been preparing him for Confirmation. And as I looked at his face, I saw the eye all glazed, and evidently the man was not attending to what I said. And I asked, "Are you ill?" He replied, "No, sir, I am not ill." I said, "What is the matter?" He answered, "I only feel a little faint, sir; for I have been about yesterday and to-day to see about work, and I have only had a cup of tea yesterday and to-day, and I feel a bit faint."

#### Infallibility.

The Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, who will be remembered as the author of a great article in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* on the Resurrection of Christ, has written a book on *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility* (Murray; 6s. net). It is just as thorough, and, we might add, just as original, a study of its subject as is the study of the Resurrection in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, although the two subjects are so far apart. Mr. Simpson must be recognized as one of the very few men who are at home in two departments of study. He is at home in the history of the Church as in New Testament criticism. Moreover, he is a genuine historian. His industry is amazing; he gives chapter and verse for every conclusion that he comes to.

#### 'The Apocryphal Acts.'

Taking advantage of the critical edition of the Apocryphal Acts by Lipsius & Bonnet, Dr. Bernhard Pick of Newark, New Jersey, has published an English translation of the Acts of Paul, the Acts of Peter, the Acts of John, the Acts of Andrew, and the Acts of Thomas, the title of the book being simply *The Apocryphal Acts* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company; \$1.25). Dr. Pick has proved by his *Paralipomena* of last year that he is quite competent for this work. His scholarship is matched with enthusiasm. He has taken pains with the translation, as though he were making a new version of the Scriptures. His textual notes are sufficient and accurate. The indexes of Scripture texts and of topics are admirable. To the general subject and to the Acts of each individual he has prefixed a useful bibliography.

It is tempting to discuss the contents of these early Acts, but it would be difficult to condense what Dr. Pick has stated succinctly enough already. It is enough to draw attention earnestly to the volume.

Francis W. Newman.

*Memoirs and Letters of Francis W. Newman*, by I. Giberne Sieveking (Kegan Paul; 10s. 6d. net). There should have been a biography of Francis Newman long ago, but it should not have been this biography. Apart from being the brother of Cardinal Newman, from whom it is only too easy to disentangle him, he had ability enough and enough experience of life to afford materials for a biography. But now that the biography has been written, it is as nearly as possible everything that it ought not to be.

The chief reason of the failure is that the biographer wants to describe Newman not as he was, but as he should have been. His bare theism is a stumbling-block. As nearly as possible every reference to it is rejected till very near the end. Then there comes a single short chapter entitled 'Francis Newman and his Religion,' which is simply an opportunity to tell us that he died a Christian.

But the whole construction of the biography is at fault. It is divided into chapters according to Newman's correspondents. First the letters of one correspondent are dealt with, then a new chapter and the letters of another correspondent. And so we go over the same ground again and again,

touching on the same public and private events, and never see what Newman is or what he is doing.

It is perhaps a minor mistake that whenever a name occurs the editor treats us as children, and tells us who it is. John Stirling, Mazzini, Horace, Pope, Harriet Beecher Stowe—we are not supposed to know anything about any of them.

And to crown all, the writing is too ambitious. In a letter to Dr. Nicholson, Newman said, ‘Do you know, when I saw in the *Illustrated London News* the face of the late lamented Brigadier Nicholson of the Punjab, I thought it *very* like you. Is he possibly a distant relative?’ Upon which we read, ‘This remark of Newman’s that he saw a strong likeness in “the face of the late lamented Brigadier Nicholson of the Punjab” to his friend Dr. Nicholson is one of those arresting suggestions which seem to strike sudden light out of the flints of ancestry which whiten the road of life along which we have come.’ A few pages further on we have a slipshod sentence like this: ‘Certain of our own words own patronymity from the Arabic languages.’

#### The Greek Genius.

Professor Mahaffy of Dublin delivered the Lowell Lectures in Boston last winter, and they have been published by Messrs. Putnam of New York and London. The title is, *What have the Greeks done for Modern Civilisation?* (10s. 6d. net).

What have they *not* done? Supreme in poetry and prose, in architecture and sculpture, in painting and music, in grammar, logic, mathematics, and medicine, in politics, sociology, and law, in philosophy and theology, they are also supreme in science; for though they did not discover the powers of steam or electricity, they nevertheless carried out in mechanics works that no modern builder, with all his vaunted control of nature, has yet equalled.

Is it wonderful, then, that Professor Mahaffy should kick against the modern tendency to depreciate the study of Greek? How thankful he was when he went to America to discover that he had been misled as to the completeness of this degradation of Greek, and that ‘a proper college education,’ was likely again to replace the ‘bread-and-butter studies’ in the earlier years of all good courses of training. So thankful was he that he

was melted into admitting that the teaching of Greek must be reformed. ‘It must be made a human and lively study, taught like a modern language by dictation and recitation, as well as by written composition and reading of authors.’

What is it that we owe to the Greeks? Above everything else, thinking. ‘The Greeks were the fathers of modern thinking’—these are Professor Mahaffy’s words. For they raised nearly all the puzzles that perplex us still. They raised, but did not solve them. And no doubt Professor Mahaffy is right in saying so. For if you turn to Calkins’s *Persistent Problems of Philosophy*, you will find that the Greeks were aware of every one of them, that they started most of them and sent them on the road of their persistence.

Professor Mahaffy, being an old man and garrulous, has many remarks to make by the way. But all the *obiter dicta* only serve to make a captivating book more captivating.

#### St. Paul in Pictures.

The R.T.S. has reprinted Dean Howson’s *Scenes from the Life of St. Paul* (3s. 6d.). The purpose of the reprinting is to give the opportunity of replacing the original illustrations, which were commonplace, by new illustrations, the work of Mr. Harold Copping, which are really artistic, and reproduced in the very best style of modern coloured printing.

#### Calvin.

Four studies in *Calvin and the Reformation*, originally contributed to the *Princeton Theological Review*, have been republished in one volume (Revell; 5s. net). Their authors and particular titles are these: (1) Calvin—Epigone or Creator, by Émile Doumergue, Dean of the Free Theological Faculty of Montauban; (2) The Reformation and Natural Law, by August Lang, Privat-Dozent in the University of Halle-Wittenberg; (3) Calvin and Common Grace, by Herman Bavinck, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Free University of Amsterdam; (4) Calvin’s Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, by Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Charles Hodge Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton Seminary. Together they make a handsome volume, and the students of Calvinism (who seem to be on the increase, whatever may be said of its adherents) must on no account neglect it. Each essay is a

thorough study of its own particular topic, and is well furnished with notes of reference.

### Christianity in Japan.

Among the books this month there is a history of Roman Catholic Missions in China. It should be compared with this book. This is *A History of Christianity in Japan* (Revell; 2 vols., 15s. net). The first volume is occupied with the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox missions. And although the book is written by a Protestant missionary, the Rev. Otis Cary, D.D., the work of the Roman Catholic missionaries is described without partiality and without hypocrisy. Says Dr. Cary: 'The honest historian cannot conceal the faults of those concerning whom he writes. Cromwell's face must be painted with the wart. The artist need not, however, write beneath the picture: "Please notice especially the wart"; and so I have not specifically drawn attention to what seem unfortunate features in the methods of any Christian workers, but have simply told the facts, usually in the words of the workers themselves, or in those used by writers belonging to the same communion.'

Dr. Cary has not the grand style. He has not the style of language affected by the historian who takes himself very seriously. But he has the grand conscience. He has the conscience of the Christian. All he writes he writes as 'ever in the great Taskmaster's eye.'

Our interest, our Christian interest, is more in the future of Japan than in her past. What is Christ to do for Japan in the days that are to come? But Dr. Cary answers our inquiry by pointing to the past. It is Christianity, he says, that has made Japan what she is. It is Christianity that will make her better. He quotes from a pamphlet by Dr W. E. Griffis, entitled *Christ the Creator of the New Japan*. Says Dr. Griffis: 'I could never imagine Bushido of itself alone, or Japanese Buddhism, or Shinto, or the Government, originating a Red Cross, a Peace Conference, a system of hospitals, a Woman's University, the emancipation and elevation to citizenship of pariahs and outcasts (*eta* and *hinin*), freedom of the press, the granting of full toleration of religion, or securing of real representative political institutions. In scarcely one of those features in the New Japan most admirable to Christians or to the best men of the Occident, do I recognize the legitimate off-

spring of Bushido or forces inherent in Japan. These have been propagated, not developed from within. No, it is to the Spirit of Jesus that we are to credit most of what is morally superb in the New Japan.'

### The Catholic Church in China.

The Rev. Bertram Wolferstan, S.J., has written a History of *The Catholic Church in China*, from 1860 to 1907 (Sands; 10s. 6d. net). The book is a trifle polemical for our taste. Mr. Wolferstan is not so much a historian as an apologist. Of actual history there is, in fact, very little throughout the volume. The book has been written to prove not what the Roman Catholic Church has done and suffered in China, which would have made a book worth reading, but that the Roman Catholic Church alone has the right to preach the gospel in China. The preface to the volume is a sermon on the text, 'By what authority doest thou these things? And who gave thee this authority?' (Mt 21<sup>23</sup>). That the authority to preach the gospel anywhere belongs to the Roman Catholic Church alone is proved in six propositions, the first of which is that to Her—and to Her alone—in the persons of the first Apostles, was the Divine command addressed, 'Go, teach all nations.'

Now it is worth noticing that the text of this sermon consists of words which came from the lips of the Pharisees; and in reply to them Christ appealed to the individual conscience. The Pharisees wanted the authority of an organization, just as Mr. Wolferstan wants. But Christ ignored such authority, and demanded that every man should recognize his own responsibility and act accordingly.

The book is written in the interests of unity. But the kind of unity it advocates is a kind that we often see advocated now—the unity which obtains when all other Christian communities are swallowed up in mine or pushed over the cliffs. How gladly would we have recommended the book had it really contained a history of the Catholic Church in China. Such a history ought to be written by a Catholic, and the publishers of this volume are enterprising enough to find a Catholic yet who can do it.

### Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

The Right Hon. George W. E. Russell had evidently as easy as he had a pleasant task set

him when he was appointed to write the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d. net). The volume is practically a transcript of Sir Wilfrid's diary. There is an occasional historical note by the editor; and at the end there are some extracts from the scanty writings which Sir Wilfrid left behind him. And that is all.

But it does not matter what the editing of the book has meant. There it is, and it is without question the most delightful biography of the season. It is the biography of a delightful man, high-minded, wholesome. It is the biography of a man who had an ideal of duty to live for, and lived for it,—lived for it through innumerable disappointments, rebuffs, and even much ridicule. Yet so far from becoming soured or one-sided, the years of hope deferred only revealed more clearly the breadth and beauty of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's character.

He was much saved, of course, by his sense of humour, a sense which he had in abundance, perhaps superabundance. And the memoir is a plentiful record of it. He speaks of the Tichborne Case. A certain woman was told that the claimant was only an impostor, to which she replied, ‘What if he is an impostor, is that any reason why he should be kept out of his rights?’

The humour is certainly sometimes exuberant—‘Dr. Temple, when Bishop of London, went down to speak on temperance at Exeter, and in illustrating his subject happened to say, “I never was drunk in my life.” Whereupon the posters which came out next morning, announcing the contents of the newspapers, contained the headline, “Startling Statement by a Bishop.”’

But sometimes it is not grotesque, perhaps it is not meant to be humour: ‘It was during this recess that the Prince of Wales all but died of typhoid fever. His recovery was hailed with delight, and later we had a Public Thanksgiving for it. I remember a great ecclesiastic (I think it was the Dean of Carlisle) saying that the Prince recovered as an answer to Prayer. One of his grooms, however, died of the fever, and one felt sorry that no one prayed for him.’

There are specimens also of his versification. This is sufficiently characteristic. The Duke of Westminster, being ill, asked Lord Cork to move his motion in the House of Lords for the appointment of a Committee on Intemperance:

Said the Duke to the Earl,  
‘A Committee I want  
This horrible drinking to throttle,  
And you, my dear Cork,  
Are the very best man  
I can think of for stopping the bottle.’

So the Earl did the business  
Without idle talk,  
And moved the Committee instanter;  
And all of them said  
They were thankful to Cork  
For thus helping to stop the decanter.

### Judas.

Archdeacon Wilberforce has published a volume of sermons on the first principles of Christianity, though the title is *The Power that Worketh in Us* (Elliot Stock; 3s. net). Now the first of the first principles of Christianity is repentance. And when Archdeacon Wilberforce is explaining repentance, he comes to the case of Judas. There is a sorrow of the world, he says, that works death. But what death? Not always eternal death. Sometimes the death of self. And then he remembers Judas.

For Judas is the favourite example of the repentance that works death. But ‘are you prepared to say,’ asks Dr. Wilberforce, ‘that there was no working of the Divine Spirit in the repentance of Judas? First, “he came to himself.” He recognized, in all its horror, what he had done; the unspeakable anguish of realization was permitted to scorch his soul. He is convicted of sin. “I have sinned,” he says. Conviction of sin never comes but through the Spirit. He vindicates the one he had wronged. “I have betrayed innocent blood.” He makes public confession; he makes immediate and total restitution; and now, perhaps, comes the weak point, because it indicates absence of hope, though even here there is an unexpressed verdict of tacit approval from all humanity: “He went and hanged himself.”’

But is there not something else? Is it not said that ‘he went to his own place’? ‘Yes,’ answers Dr. Wilberforce, ‘where we shall all go.’

But is there not something yet? Is it not said, ‘It were better for that man if he had never been born’? Dr. Wilberforce answers here that the exact translation of the Greek is, ‘It were better for Jesus if Judas had never been born.’

**Dr. Horton's New Book.**

Dr. Horton's new book is called *Great Issues* (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is itself a great book, and with it we are presented with an excellent portrait.

The great issues are: Myths, Religion, Morality, Politics, Socialism, Philosophy, Science, Theology, Literature, Art, Life, Death. Every one of them could occupy a volume, or even a library. Dr. Horton does not dream of exhausting any one of them. He does not even attempt to say systematically what he has to say upon any of them. He does not occupy the pulpit or even the platform. He sits down beside us, possibly at the parlour fire, more probably in the study, he and another only, face to face and eye to eye. And on every one of these subjects he tells quite frankly what is most surely believed by himself.

Now, Dr. Horton is neither ignorant nor insincere. Those who read this book will know what he does actually believe on every one of these great issues, and they will know that it is worth believing. And then how graceful a pen he has! With what deftness of finger he touches the spot that thrills. And how unassuming he is! With how sweet a reasonableness does he persuade us at last to the prospect of seeing Him as He is, and to the Companionship by the way.

**The Ethics of Progress.**

There is a book for which there must be many readers on the other side of the water, so often is it published. It is the book that in short chapters, and in essay form, treats of success and failure within an ethical and sometimes religious atmosphere. Such a book may have been suggested by Emerson. It is nearly always an endeavour to pass beyond Emerson spiritually.

The latest book of this kind is a volume by Mr. Charles F. Dole on *The Ethics of Progress* (Williams

& Norgate; 6s. net). Its chapters are short, as we say—on an average, six pages. Eight or nine short chapters make up a part. Altogether there are seven parts and sixty-three chapters in a volume of 400 pages. Every chapter has a catching title, and the language is simple, popularly scientific, and anecdotal. So Mr. Dole does not worry his readers with Systematic Theology or systematic anything else. He does not worry his readers with anything. We may feel that other titles would have done for the chapters, and even that another title would have done for the book. But what does it matter? We read the book, and all the while we read it we receive gentle encouragement to do better.

**Pascal.**

We hear that a study of Pascal is about to appear, written by Viscount St. Cyres, the man of all men most competent to write it. It has been forestalled, but not made superfluous, by a volume entitled *Blaise Pascal: A Study in Religious Psychology*, of which the author is Mr. Humfrey R. Jordan, B.A. (Williams & Norgate; 4s. 6d. net). We have read Mr. Jordan's book from beginning to end, and it was probably written to be read. But it might have been written so as to be read with more pleasure. The style is uncomfortable. Mr. Jordan has a curious habit of saying a thing by two negatives instead of a positive. Besides, he is somewhat out of touch with his subject, out of touch with Pascal himself, and still more with Pascal's religion. Not that he is in open opposition to either. If he were, his book might be more agreeable reading. He is simply lukewarm. And the lukewarmness does not seem to be scientific detachment; it seems to be inherent unresponsiveness. But in one respect Mr. Jordan has excelled. He has told the dramatic incidents, such as the rediscovery of Euclid, quite dramatically.

**Children's Books.****A. & C. BLACK.**

MESSRS. A. & C. BLACK still hold the lead in colour printing. And they are as ambitious as they are successful. They have a volume this year called *The Children's Book of Art* (6s.), in which there are reproductions of some of the great Masters—reproductions which are themselves great masterpieces.

And these pictures are described with a sympathy and a vividness which are bound to commend them to the interest of intelligent children. For any child to go to a picture gallery after reading this book is to get some good of the picture gallery.

There are fewer pictures in colour in *The Children's Book of Gardening* (6s.). There are only twelve, indeed, but they

are exquisite. If there are fewer illustrations, there is more reading, and it is exquisite also. To give this book to a young person is to give at the same time an interest in gardening that will remain through life.

*The Book of the Railway* (6s.) contains no fewer than twenty-three illustrations, all in colour as before. The author is Mr. G. E. Mitton, and the illustrator Mr. A. Stewart. It is a book for a railway journey. It will make the journey short and profitable.

#### NELSON.

For girls of about eleven or twelve the best book of the season, so far as we have seen them, is *Kitty Trenire*, written by Miss Mabel Quiller-Couch (2s. 6d.). If the reading of stories ever does good to girls, this book will do good to the girls who read it. And they will read it not because it is likely to do them good, but because it is such good reading.

Messrs. Nelson have also a boys' book—a remarkably cheap book for its size and its good looks. It is *The Chancellor's Spy* (2s.), by Tom Bevan, and takes us back to the days of Henry the Eighth and Cardinal Wolsey, but the chief figure is Wolsey's successor, Lord Chancellor Cromwell. It is an historical novel. Many great names come into it quite familiarly. And we think the historical probabilities have been attended to. But apart from that it is a good sound story.

Then there are two books for anybody and everybody. First, Miss Charlotte Yonge's *Book of Golden Deeds*—a beautiful volume in handsome quarto, with full-page illustrations in colour and many charming woodcuts in the margin. This is the cheapest book of the month (6s.).

Next, *A Book of Wild Things* (3s. 6d.), compiled by Lucy Lyttelton. The pictures are from Japanese artists, and they have been as beautifully reproduced as they are beautiful—marvels of art and of cheapness. The prose writers as well as the poets have been called upon for the quotations, and the whole range of English literature has been ransacked.

#### MACMILLAN.

The story of *The Little Merman* (3s. 6d.) is very clever, and it is very nice. How easy it is for a merman to get legs, and how difficult to get a soul—that is the moral of it; and how applicable it is all round. The story is so touchingly told that every little merman who reads it will want to have a soul, but of course he must get rid of all his fishiness first. There is another story in the volume, but we are keeping it for another occasion.

#### SEELEY.

Two fat volumes have been issued by Messrs. Seeley in that beautiful binding for which they beat all their rivals. There are coloured illustrations in one of them, but that is not the line along which Messrs. Seeley have gone yet. Their field, apart from the binding in which, as we say, they are unrivalled, is science and literature. And here we have a volume of each.

The science volume contains stirring records of the bravery, tact, and resourcefulness of the founders of the Indian Empire. Its title is *Heroes of Modern India* (5s.), and its author is Mr. Edward Gilliat, M.A., who was once a master

at Harrow School. Mr. Gilliat has unearthed some of the less-known Indian heroes, such as Sir Alexander Burnes, and he has told their story effectively.

The volume with the coloured illustrations is an addition to Mr. A. J. Church's famous series. This time Mr. Church has gone to Spenser's *Faery Queene* for his stories. Probably it is the most difficult quarry he has ever tried to work, and only his experience and determination could have worked it successfully.

#### CULLEY.

Mr. Culley has sent out three of his square little shilling volumes, with their pictures in colour—*Moses*, *St. Francis*, and *The Magic Nine Pin*.

He has also published two shilling stories by Nell Parsons—half scientific and half mythological. The one is 'Dawn's Wood,' and the other 'Sunshine's Garden.' They are beautifully printed and illustrated. The two, with the addition of a third story, 'Twilight's Field,' are also bound in one quite handsome volume, which goes by the title of *From Dawn to Twilight* (2s. 6d. net).

#### FROWDE AND HODDER & STOUGHTON.

Messrs. Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton make a strong publishing combination, and they have been successful in securing the services of Mr. Herbert Strang, a strong boys' author. His volume is called *Palm Tree Island* (6s.). It is the story of two lads who were shipwrecked on an island in the Southern Seas, and who came through the most wonderful adventures, perils, and privations. Their resourcefulness is a miracle of nature, and nature was as resourceful as they. There are interesting little woodcuts inserted of the implements and household utensils they made with their own hands, and there are many full-page illustrations in colour. Besides this volume, however, there is *Herbert Strang's Annual* (3s. 6d. net), the strength of which lies in its boisterous humour.

The same publishers have issued a girls' book, *The Conquest of Claudio* (3s. 6d.), by E. L. Haverfield. It is a good story with plenty of good reading in it, and a good moral which is not too obviously intruded.

Then there are three volumes for children of various ages. For the oldest, but distinctly for children, *The Rainbow Book* of coloured stories (1s. 6d. net)—its pictures all the colours of the rainbow and nearly all Japanese. Next, *Sheaves of Gold* (3s. 6d. net), a volume of stories from the Old Testament, with rather striking new illustrations.

And last of all, *The White Kitten Book* (1s. 6d. net) for the wee ones, a unique and memorable autobiography.

#### BLACKIE & SON.

There are many ways of making Christmas books impressive. One way is to increase their bulk. And that process seems to have been going on for a number of years. Now the volumes have become more handsome than handy, but no doubt it is a great thing for boys and girls to receive a good substantial volume into both their hands at once.

There are three volumes for boys. They look as if they had been cut to a pattern, outside and inside. And it is

really not of the slightest consequence which volume is chosen. They are all heroic and they are all dripping with blood-curdling adventure.

Perhaps Captain F. S. Brereton deserves the honour of introducing the list. He has gone, as many a boys' author has gone before him, to the Franco-Prussian War. His book is *A Hero of Sedan* (6s.). And he is a hero. The average schoolboy will follow his fortunes with unflagging interest from the beginning to the end. And as he goes he will learn not a little about the history of the period and the geography of the place.

The other two boys' volumes are by Macdonalds. Alexander Macdonald writes *Through the Heart of Tibet*, and Robert M. Macdonald *The Rival Treasure Hunters* (6s. each). The Rival Treasure Hunters has to do with British Guiana, not an absolutely new field, but fresh enough to be attractive for its own sake. The story is of the usual ad-

venturous favourite, but it is perhaps told in better English than usual.

Mr. Alexander Macdonald has been the better of having Sven Hedin before him. We hope the average English boy will not pronounce the book rot; the adventures are certainly impossible enough to be almost incredible.

But the girls' books are brighter than the boys'. They are very well done indeed, delightfully fresh and wholesome stories. There are two of them—*Saturday's Children*, by Winifred James (6s.), and *Clarinda's Quest*, by Ethel F. Heddle (5s.).

Yet, without gainsaying, the best of Blackie's books this year is *Blackie's Children's Annual* (3s. 6d.)—an old favourite which this time beats itself all to nothing. The story called 'Jock's Stepmother' is alone worth the price of the volume. And there are many other excellent stories and wonderful pictures in colour.

## The Life of Faith.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. W. HOLDSWORTH, HANDSWORTH.

### The Issues of Life.

WE have seen that the life of love is also a life of faith, that is, a life of fullest communion, the divine analogy of which is to be found only in the depths of the divine nature. We now have (Jn 15<sup>11-27</sup>) what may well be called 'the Issues of life.' Few Scriptures are so full as this. Every phrase is charged with suggestion, and there is not one that is superficial, each carries us to the very centre of things; each introduces us to some elemental phase of life. In such a case it is not easy to concentrate thought upon the salient points of our Lord's teaching. In mountainous regions where every peak is some gigantic upheaval of the earth, it is not easy to pick out the peaks which are highest: the general elevation makes distinctions difficult.

But as we dwell upon the words gradually, we come to see that one or two ideas stand out from the rest, and the first of these is 'the fulfilment of joy.' In the teaching of Christ there is nothing that frowns upon our common human gladness of heart, but there is no mistaking the positive claim that He makes when He tells us that our joy needs for its fulfilment the joy which is peculiarly His own. In speaking of it He uses an expression

which is constantly repeated.<sup>1</sup> This fulfilling joy is not that which He Himself feels in any one moment of His experience; neither is it the joy which He has it in Him to create. It is the joy which is of His own nature; that which is so truly His own that if it were removed He would be less in Himself than He was before. There is a joy, as there is a love, which is of the very Being of God. What is that joy? Can we describe its qualities? How shall we recognize it if at some time or other it shall touch our lives to make them glorious? The vine, Christ's chosen emblem, teaches us again. If it fulfils its life in sacrifice, then in some way, which 'in hours of insight' we can dimly see, both the love and the commandment, both suffering and its concomitant joy and peace, belong to, are bound up in, the sacrifice for which Christ stands. Is there any joy in sacrifice? Do we not commonly use the word to indicate pain and loss? The answer will depend entirely

<sup>1</sup> ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ. This form of expression is one of the most strongly marked characteristics of St. John's Gospel. As distinguished from ἡ χαρὰ μοῦ it means the joy which is essentially Mine,—'that answers to My nature' (Westcott). Moulton, however, quoting Thurm, suggests that this may be a dialectic use peculiar to Asia Minor (*Grammar of N. T. Greek, Prolegomena*, pp. 40, 41).

upon what we mean by ‘sacrifice.’ If it means nothing but a sense of loss and privation, then, of course, there is no room for joy. But if it means, as it should do, the making life, with all it holds, sacred by holding it in trust for God,—if it means that moved by love we lay upon the altar all that we have, all that we are,—then the perfect joy which goes with every expression of love is ours, and the greater the gift the more perfect the joy, until when we make the greatest gift of all, and life itself is offered up, there comes to us the fulfilment of joy, the joy which Christ embodied in Himself. It will be no wonder when the life is shared that the joy should be the same.

There is another effect of this shared life to be found in the perfect intimacy which is always the unmistakable gift of love.<sup>1</sup> ‘I have called you,’—the relation is established for all time,—‘I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.’ Then, lest the familiarity should breed contempt, the disciples are reminded that this was ‘of grace’; ‘ye did not choose me, but I have chosen you.’ Not servants, but friends, chosen friends of Christ, sharing with Him the ‘all things’ which He has known from the Father! This is a description of Christian privilege which ‘stops the heart beating and the lips are dumb. Can it be true the grace He is declaring?’ Let us note that the knowledge here suggested must be the knowledge of a person; for it is that which comes by love. It means communion; it indicates the committing of oneself to another. When the heart of either lies open to the other, and thought and purpose lie clear, and we know the things we have heard.<sup>2</sup> We are familiar with this in the blessed processes of human friendship. Our Lord shows that it is possible for us to realize the same certainty ‘in the heavenly places.’<sup>3</sup> We may know that which belongs to Him, even as He knows the many things that belong to the unplumbed depths of the divine nature. Such things are in the gift of love alone. They came to us as the dear pledges of a perfect fellowship. To love even the heart of God lies open, and man may know its contents.

<sup>1</sup> ὑμᾶς εὐρηκα φίλους, where the full force of the perfect will be as indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Matthew Arnold’s ‘The Buried Life.’

<sup>3</sup> ἐν τοῖς ἐπωράντοις. This phrase, so characteristic of the Epistle to the Ephesians, is explained as ‘the sphere of spiritual activities’ by the Dean of Westminster.

There follows upon this perfect intimacy conferred by love, this deep vision into the heart of God, another effect of the life we share with Christ, and we indicate this by the phrase, ‘effectual prayer.’ The question of the efficacy of prayer has given rise to endless discussions, and we cannot pretend to remove here all the difficulties that gather round the subject. But we may at least claim that relief seems to lie along the line of thought which is being followed in these chapters.

Our Lord holds out to us the largest hope. There is no limit to the promise contained in such words as ‘whatsoever ye shall ask,’ and ‘ye shall ask what ye will.’ So far as these words go, those who expect a full answer to their largest petition have abundant ground for confidence. But too often we exclude or forget the conditions laid down by Christ Himself. Those conditions are, in the one verse, ‘if ye abide in me,’ and in the other, ‘if ye ask in my name.’ Strange as it may appear, the two phrases mean the same. For the ‘Name’ means in the Bible what we more often call the nature; and it is IN that nature, made one with it, finding our life in it, and abiding in it, that we shall receive whatever we may ask. The words are as true as they are fraught with blessing to the hungry hearts of men. Ever we come with our petitions, sometimes clamorous enough, sometimes too deep for words: sometimes we ask for the little things of life, sometimes we seek those revelations of God to our souls which go beyond all that we can ask or think. But if we truly live our life with Christ, there will be no petition on our lips other than that which is already in His holy will. That which we ask will always be that which He wills, and His will is that which will be done. ‘Thy will be done’ is the true prayer of our Lord. It is the type of a perfect petition. We offer it too when we pray ‘in his name,’ when we ‘abide in him.’ Made one with Him by faith, we bring to Him our many petitions; we spread before Him our lives empty, hungry, aching, passionate; but never once that we may change His mind; rather that we may seek the more perfect fulfilment of His will. In this, as in everything, we make ourselves one with Him, and if we ask in His name our prayer is certain to be answered.

Joy; the intimate knowledge of perfect friendship; the prayer which marks our oneness of will with the Eternal,—these are manifest issues of

that common life for which vine and branch, and generous fruitage stand. Is there any other? Or have we now exhausted the figure? One other indeed there is. It is the 'fellowship of suffering.' In the words which describe the hatred of the world there is no rancour, no bitterness. Christ recognizes that the hatred of the world comes upon Him because He is what He is, and that it is 'for his name's sake.' His concern is not for Himself, but for His disciples. He strives to make them see that a common life means common suffering; that if men have hated Him, they will also hate them, that the servant is not greater than his Lord. Will the answer spring into vividness within them—'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Lord'? that is His one concern. In later days Paul prayed that he might know 'the fellowship of his sufferings being made conformable to his death.'<sup>1</sup> In these words the ardent spirit of the great Apostle recognized how true to the facts of spiritual life were the words of his Master. He knew they were true because they awoke in him the answering desire. He at any rate could say, 'It is enough for the disciple.'

We know the exaggeration of the truth in such teaching. It is not by the flagellations and the hair shirts of other days that we best fulfil the Lord's purpose. He never bids us seek the suffering, the miseries of physical privation, torture, death. But if these things come to us by reason of our relation to Him, if they are true issues of that life we share with Him, then He calls upon us to accept them, to recognize the pain as the inseparable part of the life, 'to rejoice inasmuch as we are partakers of His sufferings,' to 'think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to prove us, for even hereunto were we called.'<sup>2</sup>

This view of suffering, whether it be that which we are called to bear for righteousness sake, or whether it be that which comes to us by way of

<sup>1</sup> Ph 3<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> I P 4<sup>12</sup>.

service, redeems the pain from bitterness. The spirit of complaint, even of self-consciousness, departs from the suffering Christian, and he moves to the life of self-denial to which he is called, or to the actual pain of life, or even to the climax of the hatred of the world and the death it may inflict, with a perfect joy springing up within his heart as he sees that every pain he bears becomes to him the pledge of the reality of that life which he shares with Christ.

In that hour of realized rejection our Lord turns from the weakness of this world's malice and rejection to declare His own power to be manifested presently in the sending of the Spirit of truth, and He calls upon His followers to join that Spirit in bearing witness of Him.<sup>3</sup> The word 'witness,' as used by St. John, is peculiar to him. He uses it of the testimony borne by the Father to the Son, and by the Son to the Father. It stands for 'the absolute coincidence between the will and works of the Father and the will and works of the Son.' In the same way the witness of the Spirit to the Christ, and the witness of His followers, is more the reproduction of the life that is shared than any distant outside testimony that may be borne by word of mouth. And so again, in the closing words of this wonderful chapter, we come upon the idea which runs throughout it, and binds into one great unity the truths that flash out upon us in its words. *One life*, in Him, in us; He the vine, and we the branches. He that abideth in Him beareth much fruit, and every branch that beareth fruit comes under the pruner's knife, and suffers that it may be fruitful. So shall we become His disciples; in joy, in knowledge, in love, and in suffering shall we recognize the life we share with Him, and the reproduction of that life shall be the truest witness which our human can bear to His Divine.

<sup>3</sup> Jn 15<sup>27</sup>. The verb should be taken as imperative, as the R.V. indicates. Westcott, however, prefers the indicative.

## Contributions and Comments.

### John ii. 19.

'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'

THE difficulty of this saying of Jesus lies in the fact that the words bear, and were intended to bear, a double sense. To the listeners they meant that Jesus could rebuild the temple of Herod in three days (Mt 27<sup>40</sup>, Mk 15<sup>29</sup>): what the Speaker meant by them was that His own

'body' would revive after having lain in the grave for a time sufficient to ensure death having certainly occurred. It is not an adequate explanation to say that Jesus used the word 'temple' in a metaphorical sense: in order that the double meaning may stand, the word for 'temple' must, in the language used by Jesus, have actually borne the two distinct senses. The Greek word *naos* is in the LXX the regular equivalent of the Aramaic or Hebrew *חיכל*. The original sense of this word is, as we learn from Arabic, 'something colossal,'

then a 'large body,' then 'body' in general, and finally 'large building' or 'temple.'<sup>1</sup> As there is no English word which means both 'body' and 'temple,' this is one of those sayings of Jesus which can be rendered only by a double translation: 'Destroy this body, etc.' That this is the true explanation of the text appears, not only from the necessity of the case, but from the fact that the author is at pains to change the Greek word used for 'temple' from *ἱερόν* in vv.<sup>14, 15</sup>, which never answers to the Hebrew *הַבָּיִת*, into *ναός*, which is its regular equivalent; and it is not without significance that this saying is omitted by Luke, to whom, in its Greek dress, it would be unintelligible. The verb *λύειν*, in the sense of destroying the temple, comes from *Ezr 5<sup>12</sup>* LXX B; and *ἔγείρειν*, as the equivalent of Hebrew *קְרֻבָּה* or *קְרַבָּה*, could be used either of erecting a building, or of raising the dead (*Is 26<sup>19</sup>*). The saying of Jesus seems, indeed, to be a reminiscence and combination of the two passages just cited. The text is thus an example of the common Oriental figure, Amphibology.<sup>2</sup>

T. H. WEIR.

*The University, Glasgow.*



### Cushan-rishathaim (Judg. iii. 7-11).

ACCORDING to the passage in the Book of Judges, Cushan-rishathaim was a king of Aram-naharaim, who oppressed Israel for a brief period of eight years at some time subsequent to the settlement in Canaan, until he was defeated by Othniel ben Kenaz, the Judean hero. Both the name and the narrative have been freely questioned by most critics; and certainly it is improbable that a king of Aram-naharaim or any other country should have borne as part of his personal name the Hebrew term *רִשְׁעָתִים*, *risha'thayim*, 'Double Wickedness.' But I have always thought that the name, in its entirety, had a 'Mesopotamian' sound; cf., for instance, Ashur-rish-ishi, king of Assyria (*c. 1140 B.C.*), and personal names of the age of the First Dynasty of Babylon, like Sin-rish and Aa-rishat. We know how readily in other languages besides Hebrew, foreign words and names are altered so as to become significant to the popular ear. With us, for example, the word 'asparagus' is Greek indeed to the vulgar; so they make it vernacular by calling it 'Sparrow-grass.' Such changes, usually instinctive and unconscious, may also be made intentionally by way of witticism and satire.

<sup>1</sup> See Dozy, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes*; also D. S. Margoliouth's *Chrestomathia Baidawiana*, note 589.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. J. W. Gibb, *History of Ottoman Poetry*, i. 113, for examples in Turkish poetry; and Chenery's *Assemblies of Al-Hariri*, p. 177, for Arabic.

2. It is now generally recognized that the O.T. ethnical designation 'Cush' (Heb. כָּשׁ) includes at least two peoples, and those widely separated from each other. Here we are concerned, not with an African or a North Arabian, but with a Babylonian Cush. So much is indicated by the mention of 'Aram-naharaim' as the starting-point of Cushan-rishathaim's invasion of Israel. Curiously enough, the Babylonian 'Cush' (cf. Gn 10<sup>8ff.</sup>), called in the cuneiform inscriptions 'Cash' (*Kaššū*; *māt Kaššī*), is mentioned along with (Aram-)naharaim (Assyr. *Nahrīma*) in a letter of Abdi-hiba of Jerusalem as by rights belonging to the Pharaoh's empire (Tell 'el-Amarna Letters, KB v. 181. 31). And we know from the same correspondence that about the middle of the fifteenth century friendly relations subsisted between Callimma-Sin (or Kadashman-Bel), the Cassite ruler of the time, and Amenophis III. The Cassites, who are supposed to have invaded Babylonia from Elam and the Further East, their original home being situate somewhere in Central Asia, dominated the country from the seventeenth to about the end of the eleventh century B.C., or from *c. 1725* to *c. 1155*, according to Dr. King. On any computation, therefore, the period of the Judges, that is to say, the period of the settlement of Israel in Canaan, falls within that of the Cassite or 'Cushite' domination in Babylonia. Although nothing is known at present of any expedition westward on the part of these Babylonian Cushites, it is quite possible that the story of Cushan-rishathaim's oppression of Israel may preserve an indistinct memory of such an historical episode. At all events, allowing for the modifying influence of popular pronunciation or editorial humour, and remembering that Hebrew Cush may represent Babylonian Cash, we can hardly refuse to admit that the name of Cushan-rishathaim is practically identical with Cashsharishat, written Cash-sha-ri-shat, a Cassite woman's name (Ranke, p. 244, n. 7). This may be said to comprise the essential portions of both elements in the Hebraized form of the name; = כוֹשֵׁן־רִשְׁעָתִים = כְּשִׁירִית. The form Cushan may have been intended as a dual, just as much as rishathaim, on the analogy of names like Dothan, Enan (cf. Dothain; LXX, Lat. Dothaim; and Enaim, Enam). It seems possible that an editor, to whom 'Cush' or 'Cushite' was a synonym of 'barbarian' (cf. Nu 12<sup>1</sup>, Am 9<sup>7</sup>, Jer 13<sup>23</sup>, 2 Ch 14<sup>9ff.</sup>), may have added the dual endings in order to suggest the epigram 'Double Cush—Double Wickedness.'

Oxford.

C. J. BALL.